

APR 25 1944

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.  
VOLUME XXXIX

NUMBER 2

*April 1944*

---

---

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

---

---

*A Quarterly Journal* devoted to re-  
search in the Languages, Literatures,  
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

---

---

THE UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

## EDITORS

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN, *Managing Editor*

CHARLES HENRY BEESON  
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER  
BLANCHE BEATRICE BOYER  
CARL DARLING BUCK

FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON  
GORDON JENNINGS LAING  
RICHARD P. MCKEON

RALPH MARCUS  
GERTRUDE SMITH  
BERTHOLD LOUIS ULLMAN

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*  
WERNER JAEGER, *Harvard University*

M. L. W. LAISTNER, *Cornell University*  
IVAN M. LINFORTH, *University of California*

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE, *Harvard University*

VOL. XXXIX

CONTENTS FOR APRIL 1944

No. 2

Antiochus Epiphanes and Egypt . . . . .	Joseph Ward Swain	73
Had the Danaid Trilogy a Social Problem? . . . . .	Grace Harriet Macurdy	95
Acceleration of Language Teaching and the Classics . . . . .	George Melville Bolling	101
Ellipsis of the Pronoun in Seneca . . . . .	Ben L. Charney	107
Notes and Discussions . . . . .		112

JOHN A. SCOTT: The Forbidden Dieresis in Homer.—F. M. HEICHELHEIM: Supply Bases for Caracalla's Parthian Campaign.—G. P. SHIPP: *Carina*.—G. P. SHIPP: *Ab ore usque ad mala*.—G. P. SHIPP: A Latin Idiom and Pliny *Ep. iv. 2. 2.*—T. J. HAARHOFF: "Bucca, Bucca" in South Africa.—H. J. ROSE: The "Faithful Saying" Again.

## Book Reviews

119

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON and SIDNEY PULMAN GOODRICH: *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*, Vol. III (Youtie).—ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus* (Radin).—ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT: *Essays on the Greek Romances* (Durham).—EDWIN L. MINAR, JR.: *Early Pythagorean Politics, in Practice and Theory* (Cameron).—A. T. OLMSTEAD: *Jesus in the Light of History* (Broughton).—LEVI ROBERT LIND: *The Vita Sancti Malchi of Reginald of Canterbury* (Laistner).—W. H. D. ROUSE, H. J. ROSE, and L. R. LIND: *Nonnos Dionysiaca* (Einarson).—VICTOR EHRENBERG: *The People of Aristophanes: A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy* (Larsen).—REINHOLD STRÖMBERG: *Theophrastea: Studien zur botanischen Begriffsbildung* (Dengler).—HUGH MACLENNAN: *Oxyrhynchus: An Economic and Social Study* (Schuman).—JOHN ALEXANDER MCGEACHY, JR.: *Quintus Aurelius Symmachus and the Senatorial Aristocracy of the West* (Monks).—KARL LEHMANN-HARTLEBEN and ERLING C. OLSEN: *Dionysiaca Sarcophagi in Baltimore* (Johnson).—ARCHIBALD Y. CAMPBELL: *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus: Translated into English with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes* (Grene).—NICHOLAS TOLL: *The Green Glazed Pottery* (Paulin).—C. H. OLDFATHER (trans.): *Diodorus of Sicily*, Vol. III (Boak).—ARTHUR E. R. BOAK: *A History of Rome to 585 A.D.* (Larsen).—T. B. L. WEBSTER: *Greek Interpretations* (Roebuck).—ALEXANDER FUCHS: *The AGHNAION HIOATEIA Ascribed to Xenophon and Its Historical Background* (Marcus).—DUDLEY FITTS: *More Poems from the Palatine Anthology* (Grene).

## Books Received

144

**Classical Philology** is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.25. Orders for service of less than a full year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Republic of Honduras, Mexico, Morocco (Spanish Zone), Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Rio de Oro, El Salvador, Spain (including Balearic Islands, Canary Islands, and the Spanish Islands in Northern Africa; Andorra), Spanish Guinea, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 16 cents on annual subscription (total \$4.16), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.29); for all other countries in the Postal Union 40 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.40), on single copies, 10 cents (total \$1.35). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter June 20, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Y

N

ifornia

No. 2

73

95

101

107

112

119

44

of  
ar;  
age  
Co-  
eco  
ary  
in  
es,  
gle  
ess

ey  
on  
b-  
ok

a-

nd

2.  
on

C

Va

A

cia  
of  
litt  
ren  
nes  
hos  
ius

mde  
Ref  
W.  
brid  
crat  
Ma  
grou  
His  
chap  
brid  
grap  
criti  
Pto  
d'ap  
phil  
"Jo  
mat  
sixti  
XII  
Eul  
Han  
T. C  
(192  
Stud

this  
one  
thir  
sou  
bro

[Cla



# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXXIX

APRIL 1944

Number 2

## ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES AND EGYPT

JOSEPH WARD SWAIN

### I

**A**FTER all that has been written about Antiochus IV Epiphanes, king of Syria from 175 to 163, and especially after the two recent monographs of Otto and Tarn,<sup>1</sup> it might seem that little would remain to be said of this remarkable man. Moreover, the scantiness of our evidence regarding him and the hostility of our literary sources (Polybius,<sup>2</sup> Daniel, and I and II Maccabees)

<sup>1</sup> Walter Otto, *Zur Geschichte der Zeit des 6. Ptolemäers* ("Abh. Bay. Akad., phil.-hist. Abt.," N.F., Heft 11 [München, 1934]) (cited hereafter as "Otto"); W. W. Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria & India* (Cambridge, 1938), esp. chap. v, "Antiochus IV and Eucratides." See also Elias Bickermann, *Der Gott der Makkabäer* (Berlin, 1937). For the more general background see M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social & Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford, 1941), esp. chap. vi (cited hereafter as "HW"), and the *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. VIII (1930). Otto's monograph is summarized at length, with a number of criticisms, by P. Jouguet, "Les Débuts du règne de Ptolémée Philométor et la sixième guerre syrienne, d'après un mémoire de M. Walter Otto," *Revue de philologie*, LXIII (1937), 193-238 (cited hereafter as "Jouguet"), and in a shorter article, containing new material, "Eulaeos et Lénaeos: observations sur la sixième guerre syrienne," *Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte*, XIX (1937), 157-74 (cited hereafter as "Jouguet, Eulaeos"). Other important reviews of Otto are by F. Hampl, *Gnomon*, XII (1936), 30-43; H. I. Bell and T. C. Skeat, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, XXI (1935), 262-64; and W. W. Tarn, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, LV (1935), 98 f.

<sup>2</sup> Polybius is our principal source for the history of this period. The more one studies him, the higher one's opinion of Polybius becomes; but at least three things must be kept in mind when using him as a source for this war. (1) His political career in Greece brought him into contact with Egyptian affairs (xiv.

make it highly doubtful whether Antiochus' historians will ever reach substantial agreement concerning him. Otto and Tarn differ widely: the former makes

6, and xxix. 23-25), and perhaps his narrative received something of an apologetic twist because of this personal connection—he was definitely prejudiced against Antiochus. (2) He was a European Greek with little knowledge or understanding of many things then happening in the Orient. As Hampl has cogently remarked (p. 32), writing a history of the Near East in the second century out of Polybius is like writing a history of Austria-Hungary in the early twentieth century out of the fragments of one book by a western European. Hampl might have added that this western European author should be a man who was politically opposed to the Dual Monarchy, who had never visited the country, and who knew none of its languages except German. (3) For this period Polybius is available only in fragments, and modern writers are sometimes led into error because they do not consider the manner in which these fragments were preserved. Events between Magnesia and Pydna (190-168) are covered in Books xxi-xxx, of which about one-fifth remains. Nearly everything comes through the great collection of historical excerpts made in the tenth century at the order of the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus. These excerpts, varying in length from four or five lines to ten or more pages, were arranged under fifty-three topics: in each section the excerpts from one author were arranged in sequence, just as he wrote them except perhaps for an introductory and a concluding sentence by the excerptor. Our fragments of Polybius come from four of these sections: *De legationibus gentium*, *De legationibus Romanorum*, *De virtutibus*, and *De sententiis*. Presumably there were other excerpts in sections now lost. About 65 per cent of the available text of the books under discussion comes from the first of these sections, about 10 per cent from the second, about 20 per cent from the third and fourth together, and the rest from brief extracts in Plutarch, Strabo, and Suidas. Thanks to the system according to which they were collected, our fragments deal especially with embassies and moralizing. There was no place in these sections for discussions of na-

Antiochus' ambitions center around the conquest of Egypt and leaves him a broken man, with little or nothing to do, after his humiliation by Popilius; the latter considers the Egyptian affair a side issue, forced upon Antiochus against his will and, at most, delaying for two or three years the eastern program he had long been planning. But, though separated by differences such as these, the two authors agree in one fundamental matter: both seem to hold the opinion that Antiochus regarded the world as something to be conquered rather than as something to be governed. Tarn discusses conditions within the Seleucid empire, to be sure; but Otto says little of them, and nowhere does he suggest connections between them and Antiochus' foreign policy. It is the purpose of the present paper to examine these relations.

Alexander's conquests had left Greeks ruling over large numbers of orientals, but such rule became increasingly difficult as time went on. Before the end of the third century native unrest was a serious matter in Egypt and Asia and, to a lesser extent, even in Asia Minor. The orientals differed profoundly in race and culture from the Greeks, but they differed almost as much among themselves, and they were not of one mind regarding their masters. Many were reconciled to Greek rule: businessmen because they prospered under the new regime, rich landowners because the Greeks protected them from their tenants, and others because they and their ancestors for many generations had been

used to foreign rule. But the former ruling classes in the Orient continued to dream of regaining their old power, and in remote districts, where Greek military strength was not great, they sometimes drove out the Greek governors—as in Parthia and Armenia. Moreover, the Greeks had found it necessary to employ many orientals in their bureaucracies, and within a century these native assistants had sometimes worked themselves into such high positions that they envied and plotted against the Greeks, who kept them from still higher posts. And, finally, peasants sometimes revolted against their landlords, especially if excited by religious agitation. The antagonism between Greeks and orientals was partly racial, but to a larger extent it was economic, cultural, political, and religious.

Native revolts had plagued Egypt even in the third century; and, beginning with Ptolemy IV (221–203), the rulers began to show greater favors to the native gods and to allow native leaders a larger share in the government of the country.<sup>3</sup> In order to win his victory at Raphia (217), Ptolemy IV had been forced to arm twenty thousand natives to fight in the phalanx, where they acquitted themselves well and contributed to the victory. But, having thus defeated Greeks in the army of Antiochus III, these orientals no longer feared and respected the Greeks in Egypt as before. The whole of Upper Egypt threw off the yoke of Alexandria and was governed for twenty years (206–186) by two successive kings from Nubia. Lower Egypt, too, was in confusion. The Rosetta Stone, set up in 196, tells how Ptolemy V

tive unrest or for oriental politics generally. Diodorus and Livy incorporated much of Polybius' narrative into their histories, but, unfortunately, most of our fragments of Diodorus come through Constantine's excerptor, and Livy avowedly dealt with eastern matters only as they concerned Rome. All passages in Livy cited below are based on Polybius unless an annalistic source is specifically indicated; in determining origin I follow H. Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius* (Berlin, 1863).

<sup>3</sup> For general discussions of native unrest in Egypt see Rostovtzeff, *HW*, II, 705–36 *passim*; P. Jouguet, "Les Lagides et les indigènes égyptiens," *Revue belge de phil. et d'histoire*, II (1923), 419–45; Claire Préaux, "Esquisse d'une histoire des révolutions égyptiennes sous les Lagides," *Chronique d'Égypte*, XI (1936), 522–52.

suppressed rebellions dating from the time of his father and punished the rebels. New revolts soon broke out, which were finally crushed only in 184. Ptolemy did not long survive his victory over the natives, however, for he died in 180, aged twenty-nine years. His queen, Cleopatra I, continued to rule for a few years until she, too, came to an early death in 176.<sup>4</sup> Her eldest son, Ptolemy VI Philometor, was then only seven or eight years old, and the government fell to two regents, who brought about the greatest disasters yet suffered by Egypt under the Ptolemies.

These regents, named Eulaeus and Linaeus, were orientals of base origin. The former was a eunuch, the latter had been a Syrian slave; but they and other orientals<sup>5</sup> had advanced to high posts under Ptolemy V, and they governed Egypt for several years after the death of Cleopatra. Both ancient and modern writers have found in their activities evidence of gross incompetence and a great thirst for loot;<sup>6</sup> but such charges do not adequately explain the regents. Persons who advanced themselves so far cannot have been utter fools; and, while they may have enriched themselves and their friends, it is hard to believe that a great empire was bankrupted by their pilfering. The truth seems to be that these orientals had effected what amounted to a nationalistic revolution in Egypt, giving orientals positions and power once held by the Greeks, and circumstances had enabled them to do so without violence or bloodshed. The revolutionary character of their government is shown by the fact, among others, that Eulaeus put his own name on copper and

silver coins.<sup>7</sup> Their anti-Greek policies made it difficult for the regents to collect taxes from the Greeks,<sup>8</sup> who owned much of the wealth of Egypt, and hence, like most revolutionary leaders, Eulaeus and Linaeus quickly went bankrupt. As early as 173 they began debasing the coinage;<sup>9</sup> and, when their position grew still more difficult, they turned to another device often invoked by reckless statesmen under similar circumstances—foreign war. They turned their attention to Coele Syria, which Antiochus III had taken from Egypt in 200. Coele Syria was a rich country, promising loot to the victor, and its loss had wrought havoc with Egypt's foreign trade by cutting her trade routes; its reconquest might therefore strengthen the regents and enable them to perpetuate their power. Assembling the populace at Alexandria, they promised to regain the lost provinces and even spoke of annexing the whole Seleucid empire.<sup>10</sup> These bombastic promises, when addressed to the Greeks at Alexandria, were, of course, merely a demagogic exploitation of old hostility against the Seleucids; but to the regents' friends among the natives such words must have sounded very much like a promise to overthrow the Greeks everywhere.

Meantime the sprawling empire of the Seleucids had suffered even greater losses. Much had fallen away during the third century, and after the Roman victory over Antiochus III at Magnesia (190) there were further defections. Antiochus' successor (his son, Seleucus IV) retained only Cilicia, a small part of Persia, and most of the Semitic portion of his father's empire; and even these districts were full of discontent.

Conditions in Palestine probably dif-

<sup>4</sup> Both these dates are established from papyri by Bell and Skeat (p. 263 n.), correcting Otto slightly.

<sup>5</sup> Polyb. xxii. 22 tells of a certain Aristonicus, who was a eunuch and therefore an oriental and probably a former slave, who became a trusted general of Ptolemy V.

<sup>6</sup> Diod. xxx. 15; Otto, pp. 25 ff., 47; Jouguet, *Eulaeus*, is less severe upon the regents.

<sup>7</sup> Otto, p. 24, n. 3.

<sup>8</sup> See the case of Ptolemy Macron cited below at n. 34.

<sup>9</sup> Otto, p. 26.

<sup>10</sup> Diod. xxx. 16.

ferred but little from those in other parts of the empire, and it may even be that the Jews were at first rather less troublesome than many of their fellow-subjects; but we know more about them. In the days of Seleucus IV the high priesthood was held by the family of Onias, at first by Simon II and later by Onias III. The former took advantage of Seleucus' weakness to fortify the Temple and thus prepare the city against siege.<sup>11</sup> His son Onias was less aggressive and at first showed no hostility to the Seleucid government; but he and his friends were orientals, unwilling to accept extensive Hellenization. Their great rivals were the Tobiads, Hellenized orientals who were friendly to whatever Greek government happened to be in power. This family had farmed the taxes of Palestine under Ptolemy IV and was closely associated with the Greeks of Alexandria;<sup>12</sup> after the events of 200 it readily transferred its allegiance to Antioch and led the faction in Palestine which favored Hellenization and the Seleucids. When the overseer of the market at Jerusalem quarreled with Onias, the Tobiads complained to Seleucus IV, and the conflict between two Jewish parties developed into a struggle between Onias and the dynasty. The well-to-do classes, who were somewhat Hellenized, usually sympathized with the Tobiads, but the great mass of the Jewish peasantry sided with Onias.<sup>13</sup> And, lastly, there was a certain Hyrcanus, a Tobiad who had quarreled with his family, who went off to Ammon and there founded an independent state over which he ruled for several years. He was on good terms with Onias, kept large

sums of money on deposit in the Temple, and was praised by Onias as a man of high standing when the Tobiads denounced him to Seleucus.<sup>14</sup>

Seleucus' chief minister was Heliodorus, who presently murdered his master (176) and ruled as regent for the young heir until he was driven out by Antiochus IV. Most of what we know about this man comes from II Maccabees and an inscription found in Delos.<sup>15</sup> The latter tells us that he was a citizen of Antioch and a *συντροφος* of the king (one brought up with the king) and that his father's name was Aeschylus. It seems probable that he was an oriental who had worked his way up to an important post and now proposed to rule Syria in the same manner that Eulaeus and Lenaeus were just then beginning to govern Egypt. His father's name signifies nothing as to his race, for orientals often took Greek names;<sup>16</sup> but Greeks rarely took oriental names. Heliodorus is not a classic Greek name but the translation or paraphrase of some oriental name.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, Heliodorus' activities

<sup>11</sup> Jos. Ant. xii. 4. 9 (222); II Macc. 3:11.

<sup>12</sup> Dittenberger, *OGIS*, 247.

<sup>13</sup> Likewise, the fact that he was a *synτροφος* of the king signifies nothing as to his race: the Aristoniscus mentioned above (n. 5) was a *synτροφος* of Ptolemy V (Polyb. xxii. 22), but, in spite of this honor and his Greek name, his being a eunuch proves that he was an oriental.

<sup>14</sup> Heliodorus was a fairly common name in Hellenistic and Roman times, especially in the Orient, but a search in Iohannes Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* (Berlin, 1901-3), Pauly-Wissowa, and the indexes to the Greek inscriptions, reveals only two occurrences before 300. The name first appears in a list of *prytaneis* (*IG*, II<sup>2</sup>, 1740) dating from the early fourth century (it also contains the name of the poet Aristophanes). This man may well have been a metic who had somehow acquired Athenian citizenship. The second appearance is in a bilingual Greek and Phoenician sepulchral inscription (*ibid.*, II<sup>1</sup>, 3318) found near Athens. The Greek reads 'Αρρετιδωπος Ἰλιοδόπου Σιδωνος; the Phoenician is translated, "Abd-Tanith, son of Abd-Shemesh, the Sidonian" (*doros* is, of course, not a literal translation of *abd*, "slave," but *doulos* would not have made a Greek name). Earlier editors (e.g., *CIS*) dated this inscription early in the second century (about our period), but Koehler, who edited this volume of *IG* (first ed.), believed that it was "not later than the fourth century." Another Sidonian

<sup>11</sup> Ecclus. 50:1-4; cf. A. T. Olmstead, "Intertestamental Studies," *Jour. Amer. Orient. Soc.*, LVI (1936), 245 ff.

<sup>12</sup> Jos. Ant. xii. 4. 2-5 (160-85); cf. also Ed. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (Stuttgart, 1921), II, 128-36.

<sup>13</sup> The best discussion of the struggle in Palestine is that by Bleckermann, *op. cit.*

in Jerusalem raise the suspicion that he was intriguing with orientals against his master long before the murder. The Tobiads had reported that large sums of money were kept in the Temple. As soon as the poverty-stricken Seleucus learned of this treasure, he sent Heliodorus to get it; but, when the minister arrived in Jerusalem, he straightway established friendly relations with Onias and went home without the money—something which the author of II Maccabees (3:22-34) could explain only by a miracle. The intimacy between Heliodorus and Onias was such that the Tobiads now reversed their tactics and incited the people against Onias by declaring that his intrigues with Heliodorus were responsible for the sufferings of the Jews.<sup>18</sup> Heliodorus thus favored the non-Hellenizing faction in Palestine, building up his following among them rather than among the Tobiads, who were devoted to the dynasty. We also learn from an inscription found at Pergamon that Greeks elsewhere—even at Athens—were delighted when they learned that Heliodorus had been driven out.<sup>19</sup> Syria had escaped a government such as afflicted Egypt during the next several years.

Conditions in Asia Minor were somewhat different and much more complicated,

but here, too, the Greek rulers often found their position precarious. The most troublesome of the non-Greek peoples were the Galatians, who had occupied northern Phrygia in the 270's and who frequently raided their neighbors in every direction. The Roman general Manlius defeated them in 189, shortly after Magnesia; but within a few years the Galatians were again disturbing their neighbors, and in 168 they invaded the territories of Eumenes of Pergamon. At the same time there were still many Persian nobles in Asia Minor, especially in the eastern provinces, which had never been thoroughly conquered by the Greeks. These Iranians sometimes co-operated with the Seleucids, but they were not reconciled to Greek rule. Inscriptions show that they used Aramaic, the *lingua franca* of the Orient, and that spiritually they remained orientals.<sup>20</sup> And, finally, the native Anatolians sometimes became restless. There were countless temple estates in Asia Minor in which Anatolian or Persian gods were served by priests and serfs called *hierodouloi*.<sup>21</sup> The Seleucids never won the loyalty of these priests, who continued troublesome until Roman times. Native Anatolians had fought for Achaeus in the early days of Antiochus III; and almost a hundred years later they participated in the bloody revolt of Aristonicus (133), which covered all western Asia Minor. Aristonicus' headquarters were for a while at Thyatira, a town in the "Plain of Cyrus," which had been colo-

named Heliodorus is mentioned in an inscription (IG, VII, 4262) found at Oropus and dating from the early second century A.C. Our Heliodorus was undoubtedly an oriental like these men from neighboring Sidon.

<sup>18</sup> II Macc. 4:1. It seems quite probable that the story of the miracle—an angelic horseman who came out of heaven and beat Heliodorus almost to death—was put forward by Onias' friends to explain Heliodorus' sudden departure and thus reply to these charges.

<sup>19</sup> OGIS, 248. This inscription records a decree of the people of Athens (see M. Holleaux, "Un prétendu décret d'Antioche sur l'Oronte," *Revue des études grecques*, XIII [1900], 258-80) in honor of Eumenes, thanking him for the aid he gave Antiochus in driving out Heliodorus. Copies were set up in the Agora at Athens, in Pergamon, and in Daphne near Antioch. Lines 10-20 describe Eumenes' aid; the rest (ll. 21-58) tells of the gratitude of the Athenians and the passing of the decree.

<sup>20</sup> F. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain* (4th ed.; Paris, 1929), pp. 225-29; Meyer, *op. cit.*, II, 86-94, "Ausbreitung der persischen Religion in die westliche Welt."

<sup>21</sup> The evidence for these estates is collected by T. R. S. Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," in T. Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, IV (Baltimore, 1938), 676-84; see also Rostovtzeff, *HW*, II, 816, and his *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* (Leipzig, 1910), pp. 269-78; and Broughton, *op. cit.*, pp. 641-46, for the unsuccessful efforts of the Seleucids to break the power of the priests.



nized by the Persians and near which there was a famous Persian temple, long a center of oriental propaganda.<sup>22</sup> Since Aristeus called his followers "Heliopolitans," modern writers sometimes suggest that he dreamed of realizing the Stoic Utopia called "Heliopolis"; it seems more likely that the name was taken from some Anatolian solar cult with which the rebels would be more familiar than they were with Greek philosophy.

It thus came about that, ten or fifteen years after Magnesia, a revival of the Orient seriously endangered Greek rule in the Near East. The Romans had no inkling of what was going on: the missions which they sent out were interested only in foreign policy and consulted only kings and courts. Though the courts might be rent by faction and intrigue, they presented a united front to the foreigner and did not parade their weaknesses; and the Roman commissioners certainly made no effort to get samplings of public opinion in the villages of Babylonia, Palestine, and the Thebaid. But many Greeks were better informed, and their dread of the oriental revival was an important factor promoting that desire for Greek solidarity which appeared in the 170's.

This new pan-Hellenism was a complicated development, and its most conspicuous advocate was Eumenes of Pergamon. He was an intelligent and forceful leader, who brought Pergamon to the height of her power and glory, and he was the leading Greek of his day. Since he ruled over many non-Greeks in Asia Minor, the oriental revival was as serious a menace to him as it was to other non-European Greek rulers. He envisaged Greek solidarity primarily as a friendship of the various states of Hellenic culture which would free each king from fear of

other Greek states and thus enable him to concentrate his attention upon such domestic problems as the spread of Greek culture and defense against the rising tide of the Orient. This policy was well summed up in an encomiastic inscription which records that in 167 or 166 ambassadors from the Ionian League, in Asia Minor, praised him as a "common benefactor of the Greeks" who had "undertaken many great struggles against the barbarians, exercising all zeal and forethought that the inhabitants of the Greek cities might always dwell in peace and the utmost prosperity."<sup>23</sup> He made alliances with other Greek dynasties, especially those ruling in Asia Minor; he was lavish in his gifts to Athens and the Achaean League; and he carefully cultivated the friendship of Rome. He was, of course, a bitter rival of Perseus of Macedon and, like Perseus' other enemies, he was constantly importuning Rome for aid;<sup>24</sup> but modern writers gravely misrepresent his character and importance when they depict him as a mere "lackey" of Rome. He

<sup>22</sup> *OGIS*, 763, ll. 8-13; also in C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (New Haven, 1934), pp. 209-19, whose translation I have used. B. Niese (*Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten* [Gotha, 1893-1903], III, 63-69) describes Eumenes' activities as a phil-Hellenist. Rostovtzeff (*HW*, II, 637-62) gives further details and shows (p. 657) that his commercial and fiscal policies rested upon an economic *entente cordiale* with his various Greek allies.

<sup>23</sup> Polybius mentions more than thirty embassies sent by various Greek states to Rome begging aid between 188 and 172. In fact, our fragments of Polybius—thanks to the manner in which they have been preserved (see above, n. 2)—seem to make the history of the time revolve about these missions. The Romans quickly learned to be skeptical regarding such complaints—thus anticipating Vergil's warning, "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes"—and usually sent envoys to see what the state of affairs actually was. Being rather ignorant of conditions in Greece, they hoped to stop the constant disturbances there by maintaining the treaties they had signed after Cynoscephalae and Magnesia, but their hope was vain. Not until after the Third Macedonian War did the Greeks stop sending such appeals—or, at least, Constantine's excerptor cites only a few from Polybius—presumably because they had learned the danger of invoking such powerful foreign aid.

<sup>24</sup> See my paper, "The Theory of the Four Monarchies," *Class. Phil.*, XXXV (1940), 11 f.



and the other Greeks had been much impressed by Rome's victories during the 190's, and they were now scheming to use Rome's military might to promote their own policies; but they were not making themselves tools of Rome—who really had no eastern policy at this time beyond preserving peace by enforcing her treaties. Eumenes' quarrels with Perseus had much to do with precipitating the Third Macedonian War, and at first he helped Rome. In the last stages of the war, however, his Greek sympathies got the better of his rivalry with Perseus and his hopes regarding Rome, and he began to help his former rival; the Romans learned of what he had done and withdrew their confidence. But, though Eumenes' activities thus ended in disaster, his program of Roman support for Greek culture in the East was essentially sound. Actuated by similar ideas, Eumenes' son, Attalus III, bequeathed his kingdom to the Roman people in 133, and a policy resembling that of Eumenes was later adopted by Augustus and his successors, notably Hadrian. By it they maintained the predominance of Greek culture in the Near East for several centuries.

Such was the state of affairs in the Near East when Antiochus IV Epiphanes became king of Syria late in 176 or early in 175. He was then about forty years old, and, though hardly a statesman of the first rank, he was an intelligent and able man. His years spent as hostage in Rome after Magnesia had convinced him that Syrian armies could never equal those of Rome and that consequently he must never, under any circumstances, seek *revanche* for Magnesia or allow a controversy with Rome to arise; and his later stay in Athens made him strongly phil-Hellenic. He thus shared Eumenes' views regarding Greek solidarity, Rome, and the Orient; and, when news came that Heliodorus had murdered Seleucus and was

ruling Syria, Antiochus was Eumenes' choice as the man who, by becoming king of Syria, could best crush Heliodorus and continue Greek rule there. Eumenes and Antiochus then formed an alliance which lasted throughout the latter's life.<sup>25</sup> A Pergamene army under Attalus, the king's brother, escorted him to the frontier;<sup>26</sup> but in order that Antiochus might seem to come freely, the troops went no farther, and he proceeded to the capital. Heliodorus fled and Antiochus took over the government without meeting armed resistance. But we are told that he was not crowned at once because of "those in Syria who favored Ptolemy"<sup>27</sup>—presumably friends of Heliodorus who "favored" Eulaeus.

Antiochus' program for Syria centered about two great projects: the strengthening of the Greeks and Greek culture in his empire and the reconquest of the eastern provinces once held by his father and by Alexander but lost by Seleucus.<sup>28</sup> At the same time he sedulously cultivated the friendship of the Greeks and devoted great care to convincing the Romans of his loyalty.<sup>29</sup> Before he had made great progress, however, his attention was diverted by the two wars against Egypt, fought in 169

<sup>25</sup> For the alliance see *OGIS*, 248, ll. 17–20; Appian *Syr.* 45. As late as 164, Asiatic enemies of Eumenes, when complaining at Rome, mentioned this alliance with Antiochus, pretending that it was aimed at Rome, though they undoubtedly knew better. The Romans investigated and discovered that the alliance did not concern them (Polyb. xxx. 30. 4 and 7).

<sup>26</sup> *OGIS*, 248, ll. 13 f.

<sup>27</sup> Porphyry, *Frag.* 49a (ed. Jacoby).

<sup>28</sup> Antiochus' plans for the recovery of the East are discussed fully in Tarn's monograph cited in n. 1; his Hellenizing program has been studied frequently. See Meyer (*op. cit.*, II, 140–43) and Bickermann (*op. cit.*, *passim*), who gives a much truer account than Meyer of what was actually going on in the Near East at this time.

<sup>29</sup> Numerous gifts to the Greeks (Polyb. xxvi. 1. 11; xxix. 24. 13; Paus. v. 12. 4; Livy xli. 20. 5–9; *OGIS*, 249–52 are dedications of statues in his honor at Delos); delegation to Rome to pay off the indemnity, which had fallen into arrears (Livy xlii. 6. 6–12); and other assurances of good will (Livy xlii. 29. 6).

and 168, which Otto has studied with such minute care. The reader of his monograph cannot fail to admire Otto's learning and the skill with which he has arranged the complicated details provided by our scrappy sources. But many of his elaborate constructions topple to the ground upon close examination, and the developments sketched above suggest other interpretations of the events described. Let us see how Eulaeus' part in the oriental revival, and Antiochus' fear of it, influenced the wars. So far as I am aware, no one has yet investigated this aspect of things.

## II

Rumblings of war between Syria and Egypt were heard early in Antiochus' reign.<sup>30</sup> Soon after coming into power he sent Apollonius as his formal representative to festivities at Alexandria—perhaps the king's marriage<sup>31</sup> in 175 or 174—and the ambassador reported on his return that the Alexandrian court was ill disposed toward Antiochus.<sup>32</sup> Somewhat later Antiochus was at Joppa and Jerusalem inspecting the defenses on his southern frontier; and in 173 he sent Apollonius to Rome, perhaps to make sure of her favor in case of trouble. Though Apollonius had not reported plans for war but merely ill will, modern scholars often assume that this ill will indicated plans to recapture Coele Syria: it seems just as probable, however, that it was due to Antiochus' Hellenizing program and to the fact that he opposed the ambitions of the regents' friends (the friends of Heliodorus, perhaps including Onias) in his own territories.

We hear nothing more of the war until early in 169, and it seems quite probable

that the regents then had their hands forced. Otto and other writers assume that there was complete unanimity at the Alexandrian court; but if the suggestion that the regents were really conducting a bloodless revolution is well founded, or even if they were as incompetent as Otto alleges, they must have faced opposition at home. Since their power was based on their regency, the obvious course for their opponents was to remove the basis of this power by declaring Philometor of age. Their own faction might then secure his person and direct his policies. The ceremonies of his coming-of-age were observed during the winter of 170/169. As our only information comes from a statement by Polybius (xxviii. 12. 8) that the Achaeans sent an embassy to Philometor to congratulate him, we do not know who was responsible for this step; but it is usually assumed that the idea came from the regents. Otto weakly suggests (p. 45) that they wished him to take the blame in case of defeat in their proposed war. In the absence of direct evidence, however, it is just as reasonable to assume that the idea came from their opponents, who hoped thus to rid themselves of the regents. Subsequent events would favor the latter interpretation. The regents replied by declaring war on Antiochus, presumably because they hoped victory would perpetuate their rule—people start aggressive wars when they think they will win, not when they foresee defeat—and because war provided them with an excuse for getting rid of Philometor: they hustled him away to Samothrace, officially to insure his safety, though Polybius says that he stood in no immediate danger. Polybius' account also indicates that Philometor's subjects accused him of cowardice: such seasoned and successful intriguers as the regents undoubtedly foresaw that flight would discredit the king

<sup>30</sup> Two late and inferior writers (Diod. xxix. 29 and Porph., Frag. 48) suggest that Ptolemy V had planned a war of *revanche* against Seleucus IV. Otto accepts this testimony (pp. 23 f., 30); Bevan (*History of Egypt*, p. 273) is more skeptical and says "possibly."

<sup>31</sup> Otto, pp. 15 ff.

<sup>32</sup> II Macc. 4:21.

and thus make them the more indispensable.<sup>33</sup> The assumption that Philometor was declared of age by the Greek faction is further supported by the activities of Ptolemy Macron, governor of Cyprus. Polybius says that this man was sensible and capable and not at all Egyptian—that is, presumably, not at all in sympathy with Eulaeus. He refused to send the regents any revenue, though they frequently demanded it; but, when Philometor came of age, the governor at once sent him a large sum.<sup>34</sup>

Antiochus had built up a strong army, and as soon as war was declared he marched against Egypt, defeating the enemy in the first battle and seizing Pelusium. Eulaeus and Linaeus were killed.<sup>35</sup> We know nothing of the composition of the Egyptian army, though probably the regents had added many natives—we shall hear again of one of their native officers, Petosarapis—who were not well trained; the Greek mercenaries, on the other hand, would hardly put their hearts into this

war. Diodorus (xxx. 14) says that after the victory Antiochus gave orders not to kill the enemy, presumably the Greek mercenaries; and Polybius (xxviii. 20. 11) tells us that he gave a gold piece to each Greek citizen in Naucratis. Antiochus wished to make it perfectly clear that he came to help the Greeks, not to loot them.

Meantime, Philometor had returned to Alexandria as soon as he learned the fate of the regents; he was now king, with the government conducted by the Greek faction under Comanus and Cineas.<sup>36</sup> Peace emissaries were sent to Antiochus, together with a number of ambassadors from Greece who happened to be in Alexandria on other matters. They sought to excuse Philometor before Antiochus on the ground of his youth and by laying the blame on Eulaeus. Polybius, who should be an excellent source on this matter, says (xxviii. 20. 6) that Antiochus laid more weight on Eulaeus' guilt than they did but that he went on to defend his possession of Coele Syria—which was the official *casus belli*—and convinced the Greeks that he was right. Antiochus later reached an agreement with the king, which his various enemies accused him of quickly breaking.<sup>37</sup> We have no evidence as to the nature of this agreement, except that it left the two kings allies and that Antiochus later called Philometor his friend.<sup>38</sup>

Shortly after the conclusion of this treaty the Alexandrians set up a rival king in the person of Philometor's younger brother, who eventually ruled Egypt as Ptolemy VII Euergetes II but who was commonly called Physcon. As Physcon

<sup>33</sup> Polybius (xxviii. 21. 1 and 5) says explicitly that Philometor's flight was the work of Eulaeus. Polybius here assures us that Philometor was a man of steadfast character and brave in danger but admits that, if he had gone of his own free will, he would have shown himself "effeminate at heart and utterly corrupted"—words which imply that such charges were made against him. How successful the regents were in their intrigue may be seen from Philometor's continued unpopularity with the Alexandrians. Pompeius Trogus described Philometor (Justin xxxiv. 2. 7) as "exceedingly lazy and so debauched by constant luxury that he neglected the duties of his office while excessive gluttony had deprived him of ordinary human feeling. Therefore driven from his kingdom he fled to his younger brother at Alexandria." These charges are untrue (one modern writer speaks of Philometor as "saintly"), and the last statement is absurd, but the passage is highly significant. Trogus lived in the days of Augustus and was an admirer of Mithradates and the Parthians; he usually accepted the point of view of the eastern peoples, who hated Hellenistic and Roman imperialism—the very peoples to whom the regents appealed.

<sup>34</sup> Polyb. xxvii. 13 (Loeb translation misleading).

<sup>35</sup> Diod. xxx. 16. Cuneiform evidence, cited by Olmstead (p. 247) but ignored by Otto, shows that news of this battle reached Babylon between August 19 and September 16, 169, indicating that it probably was fought in July.

<sup>36</sup> Polybius (xxviii. 19. 1) says that Philometor's councilors were chosen "from the most distinguished leaders" (*ἐκ τῶν ἐπιφανέστατων ἡγεμόνων*), which in Polybius is certainly a euphemism for "Greeks."

<sup>37</sup> Polyb. xxx. 26. 9; Jos. Ant. xii. 5. 2 (243); Porph., Frag. 49a-b; Dan. 11:27.

<sup>38</sup> Polyb. xxviii. 23. 4; Diod. xxx. 18. 2; Porph., Frag. 49a. According to Livy (xlv. 11. 10), Philometor later spoke of Antiochus as his *socius*.

was, at most, twelve years old, his backers were more important than he. In his one brief reference to the episode, Polybius (xxix. 23. 4) merely says that Physcon was proclaimed "by the people" (*ὑπὸ τῶν ὀχλῶν*), which sheds no light upon the authors of the coup d'état. Porphyry (Frag. 2. 7) says the same. It seems probable, however, that his backers were Egyptian Greeks of the old school—including Comanus<sup>39</sup>—who resented Philometor's alliance with Antiochus. Apparently they thought they were still living in the third century, before the oriental revival and the coming of the Romans, for in them traditional hostility to the Seleucids was stronger than the feeling of Greek solidarity. Antiochus undertook the defense of Philometor's interests against these rebels, besieged them in Alexandria, and, when the Alexandrians expressed a

<sup>39</sup> Until recently all that was known of Comanus came from the one line in Polybius (xxviii. 19. 1) dealing with his share in making Philometor king after the regents' deaths and from two brief passages (xxxi. 19 f.) telling how he went on an embassy for Physcon to Rome in 161. Recently discovered papyri have added to this information, and the new material is discussed by W. L. Westermann, "Comanus of the First Friends (187 (?)–161 B.C.)," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, XIII (1938), 1–12. A papyrus (P. Col. Inv. 481) dated in the year 18—which may be either 187 or 163, Westermann and Wilcken (*ibid.*, p. 11, n. 2) and Ros-tovtzeff (*HW*, II, 715) preferring the earlier date—indicates that he was at that time "One of the First Friends" and probably strategos of Arsinoite. Other papyri show that in 172 and 171 his daughter held high positions at court. In 169 he and Cineas virtually took over the government, supporting Philometor. But in 161 he was attached to Physcon. Westermann merely says that this change came between 169 and 161. It seems probable, however, that Comanus was one of those Greeks who resented Philometor's intimacy with Antiochus; if so and if Comanus retained his interests in Arsinoite, his activities might help explain why Antiochus later showed such violence in this nome (see below, n. 56). At any rate, we know that the treaty with Antiochus was negotiated for Philometor, not by Comanus and Cineas, who had been his chief ministers a few weeks earlier, but by Heraclides of Oxyrhynchus, who is said by Suidas (s.v.) to have lived under the sixth Ptolemy and to have made a treaty with Antiochus. Comanus probably went over to Physcon in 169 and continued to have a large share in the government of Egypt until the division of the kingdom in 163, when he followed Physcon to Cyrene and continued the quarrel with Philometor.

willingness to receive back their king, returned to Syria late in 169.

From these few facts, which are all that our fragmentary sources give us, it is not easy to deduce the motives which actuated Antiochus. Physcon and his friends, according to the Roman annalists, charged him with aiming at nothing less than the conquest of all Egypt;<sup>40</sup> I Mac-cabees (1:16) declares that from the first he intended to annex the whole country; and Otto bases his whole theory upon this assumption. Nevertheless, the weakness of this charge becomes evident if we carefully examine two episodes—the coronation of Antiochus as king of Egypt and his withdrawal from the country late in 169.

Otto believes (pp. 53 ff.) that Antiochus took young Philometor to Memphis soon after their treaty, promising to have him crowned there by Egyptian priests, but at the last minute had himself crowned instead and made himself Philometor's guardian. This act, according to Otto, was the reason why Physcon was proclaimed king, and it was the great breach of faith of which the ancient authorities complain. The coronation of Antiochus has been much discussed. Porphyry, quoted by Jerome and Eusebius, is our only literary evidence,<sup>41</sup> and it was long the custom to deny flatly that such a

<sup>40</sup> Livy xlii. 19. 9 (annalistic), see below, n. 44.

<sup>41</sup> Porph., Frag. 49a: "Porro Antiochus parcens puero et amicitias simulans ascendit Memphim, et ibi ex more Aegypti regnum accipiens puerique rebus se providere dicens cum modico populo omnem Aegyptum subiugavit sibi." These are the words of Jerome, who confesses that he repeated *brevi compendio* what Porphyry had said *sermone latissimo*; Porphyry followed Suetorius Callineus, a rhetorician and historian of the late third century after Christ, whose narrative went back directly or indirectly to Polybius. This passage, with its sequel, telescopes Antiochus' two campaigns into one, thus raising various chronological problems; but, in general, its facts (as opposed to interpretations: *simulans*) are correct, and it distinctly says that Antiochus was crowned *ex more Aegypti*. The coronation is also mentioned briefly in Frag. 2. 7 (preserved in the Armenian trans. of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, the German trans. of which by Karst is quoted by Jacoby).



coronation ever took place.<sup>42</sup> Coins picturing Antiochus as king of Egypt, and a papyrus containing his royal orders, now leave no doubt as to the fact.<sup>43</sup> The only question is: When was he crowned—was it in 169, or was it during the second invasion of Egypt in 168? The coins and papyrus might date from either year, but Porphyry's telescoped account and, more especially, the fragment in the *Chronicle* seem to indicate that it took place in 169. Otto accepts this date, though doing so raises grave difficulties. Polybius (xxviii. 23. 4) reports that during the siege of Alexandria, late in the year, Antiochus stated definitely to Rhodian envoys that Philometor was the lawful king. Otto attempts to explain this statement away by saying (pp. 52, 56 ff.) that Antiochus was pretending to act merely as Philometor's guardian. But how could he hope to deceive anyone by such a subterfuge if he had been publicly crowned and was issuing orders and coins in his own name as king of Egypt? At approximately the same time Physcon sent an embassy to Rome to complain that, while Antiochus pretended he was merely putting Philometor back on the throne, he really was planning to conquer all Egypt; nothing is said of any coronation at Memphis, though such a usurpation by Antiochus would have strengthened Physcon's case, had it actually occurred.<sup>44</sup> In the follow-

ing spring, when Antiochus was launching his second attack upon Egypt, Philometor sent envoys "who thanked him [Antiochus] for giving him back his ancestral kingdom and urged him to keep his service untarnished."<sup>45</sup> Again there is no hint that Antiochus had been officially proclaimed king of Egypt. Polybius and Livy obviously knew nothing of such a ceremony in 169. It must be added, however, that Livy likewise says nothing of one in 168; and his silence is surprising, in spite of his repeated statement that he would mention eastern politics only in case Rome was concerned. Livy, who wrote with Polybius before him, is silent about the coronation; but Porphyry, whose narrative rests ultimately upon the same source, correctly records it. A possible solution of this difficulty is suggested by the passage in Livy, a few lines below the last quotation, in which he briefly summarizes Antiochus' second invasion of Egypt. Our only manuscript is hopelessly corrupt in the crucial sentence, which records that the people of Memphis and the other Egyptians did something, some of them willingly and others through fear. The text as ordinarily emended says that they received Antiochus;<sup>46</sup> but per-

<sup>42</sup> Niese, *op. cit.*, III, 172, n. 5; A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Lagides*, II (Paris, 1904), 14-16.

<sup>43</sup> Otto, p. 55; Hampl, pp. 37 f.; P. Tebt., 698: βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχου προστάξαντος τοῖς ἐν τῇ Κρονιδιανῶντινῃ ἀληποῦ[χου] . . .

<sup>44</sup> Livy xlv. 19. 8 (annalistic). This paragraph, summarizing the complaints of the ambassadors, gives a brief account of the campaign of 169. Ordinarily, such a report, drawn by Livy from an annalistic source, would not be regarded highly, but the general summary of the events of 169 squares remarkably with that given by Polybius and, as Nissen remarks (*op. cit.*, p. 263), "Im Ganzen ist die Darstellung der Annalen ziemlich richtig." The passage probably was copied by Livy's source directly from records preserved in the regia (see below, n. 78) and therefore provides evidence independent of Polybius that the coronation was unknown at the end of 169.

<sup>45</sup> Livy xlv. 11. 10 f. The whole passage, which is based on Polybius and which tells strongly against the theory that Antiochus was crowned in 169, reads as follows: "Ptolemaei legatis agentibus gratias, quod per eum regnum patrum recepisset, petentibusque, ut suum munus tueretur et diceret potius, quid fieri vellet, quam hostis ex socio factus vi atque armis ageret, respondit . . ." ("He replied to the ambassadors of Ptolemy, who thanked him for giving him back his ancestral kingdom and urged him to keep his service untarnished and to tell them what he wanted rather than act with force and arms, turning from being an ally to being an enemy . . ."). Otto's attempt to explain this passage away has been strongly condemned (Hampl, pp. 35 f.; Jouguet, p. 238). Otto maintains that the *munus* was a guardianship over Philometor which enabled him to rule Egypt somewhat as Antigonus Doson ruled Macedonia for Philip V. There is no evidence that such a guardianship ever existed. The *munus* was the help given Philometor by Antiochus in 169.

<sup>46</sup> This sentence (xlv. 12. 1 f.) is printed by Weissenborn-Mueller as follows: "Postquam dies data in-

haps Livy wrote something else. This is the exact spot at which the coronation at Memphis would be mentioned, had it occurred in 168; Livy at this point is paraphrasing and abbreviating Polybius (we still have Polybius' text for the second half of the paragraph); one is, therefore, tempted to hunt for an allusion to the coronation in this corrupt passage. A final argument against 169 as the date of the coronation is the fact that, had Antiochus been made king then, we should be at a loss to explain his sudden departure from Egypt: it would have taken him many months to organize his government, but he left Egypt within a few weeks, retaining only Pelusium. Otto has failed to prove his thesis, and it is best to assume that the coronation took place in 168.

Otto (pp. 66 ff.) and others suggest that Antiochus' withdrawal from Egypt in 169 was occasioned by rebellion at home, and especially by a revolt of the Jews. Rumors arose, during an Egyptian campaign, that Antiochus was dead, and Jason, the Oniad high priest whom Antiochus had deposed in 173, took advantage of the confusion to attack Jerusalem with a thousand men. Unfortunately, however, the chronology in our sources is highly confused, and only by doing violence to the best of them can we date Jason's revolt in 169. II Maccabees (5:1) says explicitly that it was during the second campaign; the Book of Daniel (11:30), written only three or four years after the events in question, implies as much.<sup>47</sup> But, even if Jason's revolt took place

in 169, it hardly seems plausible to suggest that a thousand rebels could cause a great king, whose army numbered fifty-thousand men,<sup>48</sup> to abandon a major campaign just reaching a successful conclusion.<sup>49</sup> A few years later, when Judas Maccabaeus commanded much larger armies, Antiochus did not hesitate to go off to the East, leaving the pacification of Palestine to local authorities. Moreover, even if Antiochus felt that he must go back, he could surely have spared enough troops to hold Egypt, whose shattered forces could offer him no serious resistance.

The major reason for Antiochus' departure from Egypt was undoubtedly his desire to get on with the great eastern adventure which he had long been planning; but the excuse he gave is reported quite clearly and distinctly by Polybius (xxviii. 23. 4 f.). He here records that, when the Rhodian ambassadors reached Antiochus near Alexandria, the king told them that Egypt belonged to Philometor, with whom he had long since come to an agreement and who was his friend, and that "as the Alexandrians now wished to recall him, he [Antiochus] would not forbid it. And he kept his promise (*καὶ δὴ πεποίηκεν*)." Otto, in his two brief references to this passage (pp. 59 and 64), brushes it aside as propaganda which Antiochus "klugerweise" spread throughout the Near East to promote his "trügerisches Spiel." The concluding words show that Polybius accepted Antiochus' explanation of what happened as true; yet nowhere does Otto refer to them.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>47</sup> This is the figure given by Otto (p. 47), based on the number of troops participating in Antiochus' great festival at Daphne in 166 (cf. Polyb. xxx. 25. 3-11).

<sup>48</sup> It is true that Otto tries to strengthen his case (p. 66) by dragging in a revolt at Arados in Phoenicia, whose date is even more doubtful.

<sup>49</sup> Büttner-Wobst, editor of the standard edition of Polybius, marks the last sentence as the work of the excerptor rather than of Polybius (see above, n. 2). The practice of the excerptor and the un-Polybian brevity of the sentence support this judgment. Nev-

*dutis praeteriit, navigantibus ostio Nili ad Pelusium praefectis ipse per deserta Arabiae est profectus receptusque et ab iis, qui ad Memphim incolebant, et ab ceteris Aegyptiis, partim voluntate partim metu, ad Alexandream modicis itineribus descendit.*" The words in italics are sheer conjecture. The passage dropped by the scribe may have run to several lines.

<sup>47</sup> The fullest discussion of this problem is by Bickermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 160-68, who maintains convincingly that Jason's revolt was in 168. This was also the view of Meyer, *op. cit.*, II, 156. W. Kolbe (*Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte* [Berlin, 1926], p. 152) holds to the date 169.



Polybius certainly was no admirer of Antiochus Epiphanes, but his account of the war of 169, as we deduce it from the fragments of his history, was more favorable to Antiochus, and also more plausible, than are the versions invented by more recent scholars. He says that Antiochus went to war because the regents attacked him; he defeated them, got rid of them, and made peace with the lawful king, though keeping Pelusium; while in Egypt, he tried to establish friendly relations with Philometor, whom he helped against his rebellious subjects; and when these subjects were willing to receive Philometor back, he went home. Polybius finds nothing here to criticize except the retention of Pelusium (xxviii. 18). Moreover, Polybius—who certainly was in a position to know—tells us (xxviii. 20. 10; 23. 5) that this explanation of the events of 169 was convincing to the Greek ambassadors. And this version has the further merit of making Antiochus' policy here conform to the policy he had been following ever since he entered Syria—that of perpetuating Greek rule in the East through the solidarity of Greeks everywhere.

It is not possible to describe in detail the situation in Egypt after Antiochus left, for our sources merely say that the two brothers ruled jointly until 164. In view of their youth it is absurd to suppose that either of the Ptolemies influenced Egyptian policy greatly, and there is no direct evidence to show whose backers held the ascendancy. Antiochus undoubtedly expected that Philometor's friends would rule Egypt, and Otto assumes (pp. 69 ff.), for rather unsatisfactory reasons, that they did. It seems more likely that the rivalry of the factions continued and

that in fundamental matters Physcon's friends prevailed. During the next few years documents were dated by the year of his reign, which would indicate a continuity of rule by his backers. And, above all, the government continued Physcon's policy of fighting against Antiochus, sending several delegations to Greece to ask for aid against him.<sup>51</sup>

In answer to these appeals for aid the historian Polybius and his father Lycortas wished to lead one thousand infantry and two hundred cavalry to Egypt. The reasons which Lycortas, according to his son's history (xxix. 24. 13–15), gave for supporting the Ptolemies are very interesting: he pointed out that there had never been close friendship between the Seleucids and the Greeks, "in former times at least, for the present king had acted with conspicuous generosity towards the Greeks," while the Achaeans had in times past received countless favors from Egypt. "Arguing thus, Lycortas made a great impression." Evidently Lycortas, like Physcon's backers, wished to fight a third-century war. His rival Callicrates, on the other hand, preferred to send ambassadors to calm down the brothers' hostility against Antiochus,<sup>52</sup> a proposal which conformed to the policy of Greek solidarity urged by Antiochus and other progressive Greeks. Lycortas seemed to have the majority of the League on his side, but, for reasons unknown to us, the aid was not sent.

These appeals to the Greek world angered and frightened Antiochus, for,

<sup>51</sup> Polyb. xxix. 23. 5 f.

<sup>52</sup> Polyb. xxix. 24. 10. The Loeb translation of this passage is quite misleading: Egypt and Syria were not then at war, so the translation "to make peace between the kings and Antiochus" is nonsense; Polybius' words (*καλοῦντας τοὺς βασιλεῖς πρὸς τὸν Ἀντίοχον*) indicate that the envoys were to pacify the Egyptians toward Antiochus and thus prevent war. The passage shows that Callicrates considered the Egyptians aggressors in the impending war. The whole discussion is summarized in Polyb. xxix. 23 f. (but not 25; see below, n. 84).

ertheless, even if the words are not exactly those of Polybius, Otto is not justified in ignoring them, for they merely say briefly what Polybius said at greater length. Polybius believed that Antiochus was telling the truth and that he kept his promise.

though the Ptolemies got no aid, their ambassadors were constantly defaming him and thus undermining his program of Greek solidarity. Their success was shown by the hostility of such prominent Greeks as Lycortas and Polybius. Moreover, there was always a danger that they might receive enough Greek aid to enable them to renew the war, and Antiochus dared not turn his attention to the East while his rear was thus menaced from Egypt. He therefore invaded Egypt again in the spring of 168, this time prepared to take drastic action. While the Syrian armies were still at Pelusium, Philometor sent the envoys to thank Antiochus for "giving him back his ancestral kingdom" and to ask what he wanted. Antiochus replied with extreme demands for territory, which the Egyptians refused to grant.<sup>53</sup> Probably this second war and these demands were the great treachery;<sup>54</sup> and, if we knew Antiochus' version of the story, we might find that he had something to say about the treachery shown by Philometor in inciting the whole world against his benefactor. Daniel (11:27) says that there was treachery on both sides, as was undoubtedly the case.

When Antiochus returned to Egypt, he found friends there who welcomed him. Livy, following Polybius, says that some people "received" (?) him willingly; and we know that Ptolemy Macron, who had formerly shown his enthusiasm for Philometor, now deserted the Egyptians to enter the service of Antiochus.<sup>55</sup> Many of

Philometor's friends apparently preferred Antiochus to Physcon. As to their reasons for so preferring him, we are left to sheer speculation. Personalities and the desire for power presumably played their usual part, but larger issues were probably also at stake. In later years Physcon and his friends preferred to continue the policies of his father, Ptolemy V, which included extensive concessions to the natives; Philometor, on the other hand, showed himself more sympathetic to Antiochus' program of Hellenization and Greek solidarity. Otto sees only a struggle of the two brothers for the kingship of Egypt and develops at length (p. 68) a theory drawn from Livy, who states (xlv. 11. 2-3, and 5) that, when Antiochus withdrew from Egypt in 169, he confidently expected that the two boys would soon destroy each other in civil war and thus enable him to reoccupy the country easily. Since Livy is following Polybius in this section, such a theory regarding Antiochus may have been put forward by the embassy sent by the brothers to the Achaean League early in 168, when it may have convinced Polybius; but we have seen that others were not convinced, and it is hard to believe that Antiochus really gave up what he already had merely in order to get it back more easily. There can be no doubt, however, that the ruling class in Egypt was divided into two bitterly hostile factions; and, since the native question was then the most important issue facing Egypt, it seems probable that the two factions quarreled about it as much as about anything.

During his second invasion of Egypt, Antiochus was guilty of much looting and devastation,<sup>56</sup> from which the first inva-

<sup>53</sup> Livy xlv. 11. 10.

<sup>54</sup> That this was Polybius' view is suggested by xxix. 26. 1: "Disregarding all that he had said and signed, Antiochus was preparing a war against Ptolemy." (Büttner-Wobst believes this sentence to be by the excerptor.) Cf. Diod. xxxi. 1. Furthermore, Polybius was much more hostile to Antiochus in this second campaign than in the first. There are, unfortunately, no fragments containing his exact words, but Livy follows him (xlv. 11) and reflects his general animosity.

<sup>55</sup> Livy xlv. 12. 2 (see above at n. 46); II Macc. 10:12 f. (see n. 34).

<sup>56</sup> Porph., Frag. 49a; P. Tebt. 781, dated about 164, speaks of a temple of Ammon at Moëris in Arsinoite sacked by Antiochus' soldiers in the "second year," i.e., of Physcon, or 168. B. A. van Groningen (*Aegyptus*, XIV [1934], 120), commenting on P. Tebt. 698 (the one giving Antiochus' order as king of Egypt), emphasizes the fact that this order was addressed "to the

sion had been conspicuously free. He occupied Memphis, had himself crowned king of Egypt, and slowly advanced upon Alexandria. When he was at the suburb of Eleusis, only a few miles from the city, a Roman embassy under Popilius Laenas handed him the famous ultimatum ordering him out of Egypt. As Antiochus had long since made up his mind never to fight Rome, the only thing he could do was withdraw.

We may well agree with the author of Daniel (11:30) that Antiochus was "grieved" on this occasion, but Tarn has shown conclusively that Otto and the others are badly mistaken when they picture him as a broken man thereafter.<sup>57</sup> His armies were unimpaired, the loot of Egypt had replenished his coffers,<sup>58</sup> and he was now able to devote himself to the great task of regaining the eastern territories that had revolted after his father's death. But his activities were seriously impeded by native revolts, such as those in Palestine, and he died in 163 before his work was accomplished. The dream of Greek solidarity vanished after Ptolemy IV, and the Seleucid Empire, weakened by dynastic feuds, was torn asunder by the orientals—by Parthians from the East, by important native dynasties such as those in Palestine, Nabataea, and Commagene, and by countless minor chieftains.

Popilius may have thought that he "saved" Egypt by driving out the foreign aggressor, but he failed to realize that Egypt's troubles were not foreign but domestic. In a large way they were caused

by the breakdown of the elaborate economic machine constructed by the early Ptolemies and by the loss of trade with the East; but, more immediately, the great issue during the 160's was native unrest. Of all this Popilius knew nothing, and he remedied nothing. After urging the two brothers to rule in harmony, he left the country. Before long a native Egyptian named Petosarapis, who had risen to prominence under Eulaeus, attempted to expel Philometor and make Physcon sole king. Perhaps he hoped to become a second Eulaeus, making himself guardian of the young Physcon, or perhaps he thought that Physcon's backers (such as Comanus?), having been trained under Ptolemy V, would continue that king's policy of favoring the Egyptians—as in fact they did. Petosarapis' attempt failed, however, and he barely escaped from Alexandria with his life. He then appealed to the natives, and soon all Egypt was ablaze from the Delta to the Fayum and to Thebes. Almost two years passed before the government subdued the last rebel stronghold in the Thebaid (165).<sup>59</sup> From a papyrus preserving a decree of 164 we learn something of the widespread devastation that followed this insurrection and of the government's efforts at relief. From other papyri we learn that minor revolts and race riots continued for several years, and we find reference to native attacks upon Greeks, house-searchings for arms by the police, and the like.<sup>60</sup> Later in 164, moreover, Physcon's backers expelled Philometor from Egypt; but in the next year Philometor was recalled and the kingdom divided, Philometor retaining Egypt and Physcon getting Cyrene. Thereafter, throughout the second century, family

cleruchs of the Crocodilopolite nome," whereas this nome had heretofore been called Arsinoite. He plausibly deduces that Antiochus planned extensive changes in the government of Egypt, as well as the obliteration of the memory of the great Arsinoë, wife of Philadelphus, after whom the nome had been named.

<sup>57</sup> Tarn, *Greeks*, pp. 183 f. and 192; Otto, esp. p. 84.

<sup>58</sup> Polyb. xxx. 26. 9.

<sup>59</sup> Diod. xxxi. 15a.

<sup>60</sup> The decree is published by U. Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit* (Berlin, 1927), No. 110; see also Wilcken's commentary, esp. p. 479. For further evidence of Egyptian unrest see Nos. 7, 8, and 15, and commentaries.

feuds and native uprisings were as frequent and as disastrous in Egypt as in Syria.

### III

Every discussion of Antiochus' campaigns in Egypt must include reference to Rome, though many writers have overestimated her importance in the matter. The Syro-Egyptian wars arose over oriental issues, and not until the very end did Rome's attitude make a great difference. Eulaeus and Lenaeus, when laying their plans, presumably took into consideration the fact that Rome and Macedon were then engaged in the Third Macedonian War (171-168), but domestic issues might have forced the regents into war anyhow; and, though Antiochus had turned his attention to the East in order to avoid trouble with Rome, he would undoubtedly have defended himself when attacked. Had Rome shown great concern over his first invasion of Egypt, he might have hesitated to embark upon the second; but she did not. Therefore, the interpretation which Otto and many others have given to Popilius' activities in Egypt deserves more criticism than it has yet received.

A study of Rome's international policy must begin with a review of her domestic politics at this time. Within a few years after Magnesia the Scipios lost their influence in Rome and leadership passed to other noble families. M. Aemilius Lepidus and the Fulvii dominated Roman political life for several years with the aid of such families as the Claudii, the Manlii, and the Mucii Scaevolae and that of the elder Tiberius Gracchus. These men were not much interested in Greek affairs, yet they could not ignore them; we have seen that Greek factions frequently importuned Rome for aid and that the new Roman policy strove to maintain the status quo established after Cynoscephalae and Magnesia. The men now ruling

Rome were much more interested in domestic matters, being faced with countless problems resulting from the wars of the last generation. Their reforms included the first law against *ambitus* (182), the *lex Baebia* and the *lex Villia* (180), and numerous efforts to relieve agrarian unrest by land distributions and colonization in Cisalpine Gaul; their sons were leaders in the Gracchan agitation nearly fifty years later, which might be regarded as in a way a resumption of these policies.<sup>61</sup> Rome's problems were not solved, however, and discontent rose high among the various orders. As so often in the history of the Roman Republic, ambitious men whose families were noble but not of the inner circle thereupon publicly championed the cause of the people and were thus elected to high offices to which they could not otherwise have aspired. These men were demagogues rather than democrats, acting with great insolence when in office, both at Rome and in the provinces, and constantly quarreling with the senate. Two plebeian consuls were elected for the first time in 172, while six of the eight consuls and the majority of the praetors from 173 to 170 were men not belonging to the former ruling caste.<sup>62</sup> We need not pause to inquire what connections, if any, existed between these developments and the war with Macedon, but it may be remarked that the senatorial aristocracy favored war, while the populace wanted peace.<sup>63</sup> As soon as the demagogic leaders saw that war was inevitable, however, they at once began intriguing for high commands. The consuls for 171 and 170 soon showed their incompetence in the field; their demagoguery ruined discipline in the army; and they showed less

<sup>61</sup> The complicated family relationships of the second century are set forth in F. Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (Stuttgart, 1920), chaps. iv and v.

<sup>62</sup> Münzer, *op. cit.*, pp. 216-20.

<sup>63</sup> Livy xlii. 14. 9 (Polyb.).

zeal in fighting Perseus than in looting their Greek allies—as the latter complained bitterly in 170.<sup>64</sup> These untoward events gave the senators their chance: the ruling faction made its peace with the Scipios, arranged several spectacular political trials, and in the elections at the end of 170 it elected Q. Marcius Philippus, who was given the command against Perseus. Thereafter Roman arms fared better, but political dissension at Rome became more bitter, centering around the impeachment and acquittal (by the narrow majority of 8 centuries out of 373) of the censors, C. Claudius Pulcher and Tiberius Gracchus.<sup>65</sup> At the end of 169 the aristocrats were again successful, and L. Aemilius Paulus was elected consul. He won the war at Pydna on June 22, 168.

These political controversies at Rome must be kept in mind when studying the events leading up to Popilius' ultimatum. Antiochus was from the first anxious to retain the good will of Rome and shared Eumenes' hopes of co-operation with her. Early in 173 he sent an embassy<sup>66</sup> to renew his father's alliance and friendship and to pay the final instalments on his father's indemnity—which had fallen into arrears, apparently without strong protest from Rome, thus showing that, in the days of Lepidus and Fulvius, Rome did not even insist upon its financial rights under the treaty; she had also allowed Antiochus to build warships, to acquire elephants, and to recruit troops west of the Taurus Mountains, all in violation of the treaty.<sup>67</sup> In the same year the Romans sent an embassy to Alexandria "to renew friendly relations,"<sup>68</sup> and a year later (172) both Antiochus and Ptolemy (i.e., the regents) assured other Roman envoys that

they would remain true to Rome in case she went to war with Perseus.<sup>69</sup>

As soon as Eulaeus declared war on Syria, Antiochus sent envoys to Rome to complain of the Egyptian aggression; an Egyptian embassy followed to watch what they did.<sup>70</sup> These envoys probably arrived at Rome just as the agitation against the censors was reaching its climax.<sup>71</sup> The Egyptian ambassadors found a friend in Aemilius Lepidus, pontifex maximus since 180 and *princeps senatus* since 179 and easily the most eminent man in Rome, who gave them valuable aid and advice;<sup>72</sup> but the distracted senate was unwilling to act in this oriental quarrel and referred the whole matter to the consul Philippus, then commanding against Perseus.<sup>73</sup> During the next several weeks, however, Philippus did nothing about Syro-Egyptian affairs. Antiochus' military successes, and especially his march on Alexandria in the late autumn of 169, seem to have attracted Roman attention, for T. Numisius was sent to Egypt to urge peace between Antiochus and Physcon.<sup>74</sup> Perhaps it is possible to see the friendly hand of Lepidus in this

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.* 26. 7 f. (annalistic).

<sup>70</sup> Polyb. xxviii. 1. 7.

<sup>71</sup> According to Livy (xliii. 16. 12 [annalistic]), the trial opened on September 24 (=July 11, Julian; see below, n. 77); Antiochus defeated the regents in July (see above, n. 35); the envoys had been sent before this victory but after the war started.

<sup>72</sup> Lepidus had visited Egypt with a Roman embassy in 200 and was well disposed toward the Ptolemies thereafter. His descendant, Lepidus the Triumvir, cast coins on which he boastfully referred to his ancestor as "tutor regis," from which some historians have inferred that Rome exercised a protectorate over Egypt after 200. Otto shows (pp. 27 ff.) that this was not the case, citing many authorities to support his view. Nevertheless, the elder Lepidus helped the Egyptian envoys when they were in Rome. They had been instructed to offer mediation between Perseus and Rome (Polyb. xxviii. 1. 7; Loeb translation badly jumbled—for Antiochus read Perseus). Lepidus persuaded them to avoid such presumption.

<sup>73</sup> Polyb. xxviii. 1. 9.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.* xxix. 25. 3 f. Perhaps Livy's failure to mention this mission is because it accomplished nothing—as Polybius admits.

<sup>65</sup> Livy xliii. 5-8; 14 (annalistic).

<sup>66</sup> Livy xliii. 16 (annalistic).

<sup>67</sup> Livy xliii. 6. 6-12.

<sup>68</sup> Polyb. xxxi. 2. 11; xxx. 25. 3-11.

<sup>69</sup> Livy xlii. 6. 4.



mission, which accomplished nothing at all. At about the same time Philippus, taking his cue apparently from this mission, quietly suggested to the Rhodians that they mediate between the two kings.<sup>75</sup> After some delay, Rhodian ambassadors visited Antiochus, then besieging Alexandria; as indicated above, he convinced them that he was merely trying to restore Philometor to his rightful throne and that he was about to leave Egypt anyhow.<sup>76</sup> And, finally, during the last days of the siege of Alexandria in 169, Physcon sent an embassy to Rome imploring aid. His ambassadors appeared before the senate on January 1, 168,<sup>77</sup> declared that Antiochus was planning to annex all Egypt, and assured the senators that Roman prestige was everywhere so high that, if they merely gave a sign of their displeasure, Antiochus would at once withdraw to Syria.

The Fathers were deeply moved by the entreaties of the Alexandrians and at once sent Popilius Laenas [and others] to bring an end to the war between the two kings. They were ordered to go first to Antiochus and then to Ptolemy [Physcon] and announce to them that if they did not desist from war the one who continued it would no longer be considered a friend and ally.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.* xxviii. 17. 4.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.* xxviii. 17. 15; 23. 1-5.

<sup>77</sup> Livy (xlv. 19. 6 [annalistic]) makes it quite clear that they were waiting in Rome at the beginning of the consular year 168 and appeared before the senate about the second day of that year—March 16. We know, however, that at this time the Roman calendar was seventy-five days in advance of the Julian—Livy (xlv. 37. 8) mentions an eclipse on September 4, 168, which really occurred on June 21—which makes this consular year begin on December 31, 169, Julian.

<sup>78</sup> Livy xlv. 19. 6-14 (annalistic). Polybius (xxix. 2) gives a much briefer account: "The senate, when it heard that Antiochus had become master of Egypt and very nearly of Alexandria itself, thinking that the aggrandizement of this king concerned it in a measure, dispatched an embassy under Gaius Popilius to bring the war to an end and in general to see what the exact state of affairs was [τὸν τε πόλεμον λίσσοντας καὶ καθόλου θεωροῦντας τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων διάθεσιν ποία τις ἔσται]." This fragment of Polybius says nothing of the embassy from Physcon or of the method to be used for ending

Otto (pp. 60 ff.) is not satisfied with this account and gives a very different version of things. On the basis of alleged chronological difficulties he decides that Livy has woven together the accounts of two separate embassies from Alexandria and two from Rome. The first embassy, sent by Physcon, reached Rome early in the fall of 169, and was answered by the mission of Numisius, which bore the message Livy reports, though perhaps in an even milder form. A second embassy was later sent by the two Ptolemies after their reconciliation, and it was answered by the mission of Popilius, with a much stronger message ordering Antiochus out of Egypt. Otto also believes that Popilius was in-

the war and adds the phrase about learning the exact state of affairs. These discrepancies have caused much learned discussion, nearly always with severe criticism of Livy. Nissen (*op. cit.*, p. 263) believed that the senate sent Popilius on its own initiative, but later in the year; Niese (*op. cit.*, III, 175, n. 5) found "mancherlei Fälschungen" in Livy's account and rejected everything not in Polybius; and Otto subjected Livy to the drastic and wholly arbitrary editing described in the next paragraph. But I can find no contradictions between Livy and Polybius, and the only certain mistake in this paragraph of Livy is his reference to a naval battle at Pelusium. The fact that Polybius says nothing of Physcon's embassy is not surprising: this fragment comes from the *De legationibus Romanorum*, while the story of Physcon's embassy would have been put in the *De legationibus gentium* had the excerptor thought it worth including. The excerptor probably wrote the introductory words himself ("The senate . . . in a measure"); and, of the two phrases quoted above in Greek, the first is conventional and used repeatedly by Polybius, while the substance of the second is found in his discussions of several other Roman embassies. In fact, it is not impossible that the excerptor composed the whole paragraph—perhaps abbreviating a longer one—as an introduction to the full account of Popilius' activities in Egypt, which comes next in the *Excerpta* (ed. Bössevalin *et al.* [Berlin, 1903], I, 55). Livy's annalistic source, on the other hand, was probably based on records kept by the pontifex maximus, whose archives—kept in the regia and from which the *annales maximi* were eventually compiled—were one of the major sources of information available to Roman historians. The pontifex maximus at this time was Aemilius Lepidus, whose sympathies for Egypt would have encouraged him to make such a record as this. I therefore accept Livy's account as substantially correct and confirmed in all essentials by Polybius. Had Niese and Otto bothered to look behind the present printed text of Polybius, they might perhaps have written differently (see also n. 84 below).



structed not to present this ultimatum until Aemilius Paulus had defeated Perseus—though Paulus had not yet left Rome! This version of the story is hard to accept. Neither Polybius nor Livy refers to an embassy from the two brothers, but Otto has found mention of one in Justin (xxxiv. 2. 8); an examination of this text shows, however, that Justin has, as usual, merely confused things and that he is really referring to Physcon's embassy. Otto is no more successful in explaining away other minor difficulties. But the major and decisive criticism of his version of the story is that, according to it, the Romans knew very well that Antiochus had already left Egypt when they sent the ultimatum ordering him out! Otto recognizes this difficulty and tries to escape it by saying that the brothers "felt themselves to be still at war with Antiochus," for they were sure he would return (p. 67). But were the Roman senators equally sure that Antiochus would again invade Egypt? Was it their practice to prepare ultimatums on remote contingencies and even send embassies to present them? Otto leaves them in the ridiculous position of mildly suggesting peace when Alexandria was in danger, but sending a strong ultimatum when they knew that what they demanded had already happened. Moreover, the fact that Popilius hastened to leave Rome within three days gives further proof that the Romans thought Antiochus was still besieging Alexandria; when word came that he had withdrawn from Egypt, Popilius was left in Greece with nothing to do.<sup>79</sup> And, finally, Otto's chronological difficulties disappear on closer examination. They are due to his desire to have Antiochus leave Egypt in time to suppress Jason's revolt late in the fall of 169. They are eliminated in the true chronology, which seems to be about as follows:

<sup>79</sup> Livy xlv. 20. 1 (annalistic); 29. 1-4.

Pelusium captured, July, 169; peace with Philometor, August or September; Physcon's revolution, before October 4 (his "year 1" ended on that day); siege of Alexandria, November-December; Numisius' mission, November; Antiochus leaves Egypt late in December; Physcon's embassy leaves for Rome early in December and addresses the senate, January 1, 168; news of Antiochus' departure reaches Rome a week or two later. Clearly, Popilius was ordered to mediate between Antiochus and Physcon, not between Antiochus and the brothers. Polybius and Livy are right; Justin and Otto are wrong.<sup>80</sup>

After his first withdrawal from Egypt, Antiochus sent expensive gifts, and probably bribes as well, to various Greek states and to Rome;<sup>81</sup> and he flatly refused to enter into an alliance proposed by Perseus—though his friend Eumenes dallied with the idea, to his later sorrow.<sup>82</sup> The two Ptolemies, as we have seen, sent embassies to various Greek cities, and Philometor sent a gift of grain to the Romans in Chalcis;<sup>83</sup> but, as indicated above, there is no evidence for another embassy to Rome. Philippus undoubtedly learned soon of the *senatus consultum* of January 1 and of Popilius' mission, but apparently he believed that Antiochus' withdrawal from Egypt ended the matter. He paid no attention to the discussions in the Achaean League about the aid asked by the first Alexandrian embassy; but a few

<sup>80</sup> Otto got off on the wrong foot by assuming that Antiochus intended from the first to annex Egypt. His inexorable logic then dragged him from one mistake to another. His first assumption led him to put the coronation in 169; this caused him to put Jason's revolt in that year; this made him take Antiochus out of Egypt early in the fall of 169; and this forced him to the amazing feat of rejecting the clear, definite, and plausible testimony of Livy and Polybius in favor of the confused jumble of Justin.

<sup>81</sup> Polyb. xxviii. 22.

<sup>82</sup> Livy xlv. 24; Polyb. xxix. 5-8.

<sup>83</sup> Polyb. xxix. 23. 5 f.; *OGIS*, 760.

weeks later, when Antiochus again invaded Egypt and the Ptolemies again begged for aid, he suggested to the Achaeans—just as he had suggested to the Rhodians the year before—that they follow Roman policy and try to negotiate peace, citing Numisius' mission as typical of Roman policy. The Achaeans sent three envoys, of whom we hear nothing more, but they obviously accomplished nothing.<sup>84</sup> We have no evidence as to what the senate thought of Antiochus' second invasion of Egypt; but, while we cannot say definitely that it did not renew its instructions to Popilius, there is no record of such action.

A study of Popilius' character and earlier career suggests another explanation of his greatest achievement. The ambassador was Gaius Popilius Laenas, one of the two plebeian consuls elected in 172 and brother of Marcus, who had been consul in 173. Both men were members of that aggressive group which was then forcing its way into high office and both were guilty of many highhanded actions.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>84</sup> Polyb. xxix. 25. 6. Both Otto (pp. 75 ff.) and Niese (*op. cit.*, III, 150) again fall into grave error from what I must consider a careless use of the fragments of Polybius. Both these writers take chaps. 23, 24, and 25 as one continuous narrative, describing the events of a few days, and with chaps. 24 and 25 describing one meeting of the Achaean League. As a matter of fact, these chapters are made up of two consecutive fragments, preserved in the *De legationibus gentium*, each introduced as usual by the word *ἐν*, and describing the Achaean reception of two legations separated by several weeks. The first fragment (chaps. 23 and 24) describes two meetings of the Achaean League, during the winter before war was resumed, at which they discussed sending the aid asked by the two Ptolemies, but this aid was not sent (see above, n. 52). The second fragment (chap. 25) describes another meeting of the League a few weeks later, after war had started (*ἐν τῷ ἑσπέρῳ πόντῳ*, in fine) and with very different dramatis personae, at which aid was again discussed and to which Philippus sent his letter suggesting mediation. Editors of Polybius would preserve the chronological sequence of events better if they inserted chap. 26 (preserved in the *De sententiis*) between chaps. 24 and 25.

<sup>85</sup> The elder brother, Marcus, was little better than a professional slave catcher. During his consulship he provoked an unauthorized war against a friendly Ligurian tribe, in the course of which three thousand

Livy says (xlii. 10. 11 f.) that Gaius was extremely unpopular with the senate and that, when he and his colleague, P. Aelius, set their hearts upon commands in Macedonia, it refused to let them raise troops. In fact, Livy seems to imply that the senate postponed the war for a year rather than let either of them command.<sup>86</sup> Popilius was next heard of in 170, when he was sent to Greece—was it to get him out of Rome at this time of domestic crisis?<sup>87</sup>—bearing a decree of the senate ordering that cities should not give Roman commanders supplies unless ordered by the senate to do so. This decree was in reply

Roman soldiers were killed, and he sold his ten thousand captives into slavery. When the senate ordered him to restore them to liberty, he successfully defied that body, fined the praetor who had criticized him, and repeated his exploit on a smaller scale. In the following year, when Gaius was consul, two tribunes passed a plebiscite against Marcus, but his brother saved him. The whole sorry story is told in Livy xlii. 1; 7–10; 21 f., following an annalistic source which may be tinged somewhat with Gracchan sentiments (see n. 96 below) but which undoubtedly contains a large measure of truth. A little later we find Marcus trying to get high posts in the army for his political friends (Livy xlii. 33. 1–3 [annalistic]). During the war he went to Greece, flocking with many others of his sort, where he was given command of five thousand men but was disgracefully defeated by two thousand Macedonians (Livy xlii. 13 [Polyb.]). In spite of these defects in his character, Marcus' political career prospered, and in 159 he became censor—the official guardian of Rome's morals!

<sup>86</sup> Livy develops the story, in Book xlii, as follows: The senate wished to go into the question of Marcus and the Ligurians, but the consuls refused (10. 9–11); the senate retaliated by ordering both consuls to Liguria as their province, refusing to assign Macedonia (10. 12); the consuls refused to transact any business except that connected with the provinces (10. 15). In all this Livy follows an annalistic source. Then comes a long interlude (11–18. 5) from Polybius, describing Eumenes' visit to Rome and the attempt upon his life. Resuming his annalistic source at 18. 6, Livy continues, "After the Macedonian War had been postponed for a year," the praetors went to their provinces. Even yet the consuls would not go (21. 1), for which they were severely censured (21. 3). After two tribunes had threatened criminal prosecution of Marcus, the consuls left Rome (22. 1); but, when Gaius returned at the end of the year, he was howled down in the senate (28. 3).

<sup>87</sup> One of his cronies, C. Lucretius, was convicted and fined 100,000 asses shortly after Gaius' departure (Livy xlii. 8. 9 f. [annalistic]).

to the complaints of the Greeks that Roman generals were looting them.<sup>88</sup> While in Greece, Popilius was ordered to take one thousand men to winter quarters; fortune favored him, and with these troops he managed to keep Perseus out of Stratus, a strong place in Aetolia.<sup>89</sup> But such a command was not worthy of an ex-consul, and Popilius returned to Rome in 169. Early in 168 he started to Egypt; but, when his mission lost its excuse for being by Antiochus' withdrawal from that country, Popilius remained in Greece looking for something to do, first at the Roman naval base at Chalcis and later in Delos.<sup>90</sup> Early in the spring Antiochus again invaded Egypt; and several weeks later, during the excitement that followed the victory at Pydna,<sup>91</sup> it occurred to Popilius that a public humiliation of Antiochus would provide a fitting substitute for the military laurels he had not won in Macedonia. On his way to Egypt he stopped in Rhodes, where he delivered a tirade before the people: he had no authority at all to speak, but the violence of his language persuaded the Rhodians that he spoke for the senate; and he so frightened them that some of those whom he accused of befriending Perseus committed suicide, others fled, and still others were executed by their panicky fellow-citizens.<sup>92</sup> After this achievement Popilius proceeded to Egypt, where he showed Antiochus the decree of the senate passed in January.<sup>93</sup> Antiochus

submitted. Popilius' conduct at Eleusis was quite different from what the senate had intended when passing the decree;<sup>94</sup> but it was successful, and it redounded to the glory of Rome, so Romans continued to boast about it.<sup>95</sup> Popilius thereby achieved his great ambition. He was admitted to the new aristocratic clique that governed Rome after the war, and his descendants continued their gangster-like activities for several generations.<sup>96</sup>

The interpretation of these events depends, of course, upon the idea one holds of Rome's foreign policy. In recent years this policy has often been pictured in very dark colors as the principal cause of the collapse of Greek civilization. The charges are that Rome bled the Greek world white by indemnities and looting and that her diplomats sought, first of all, to keep the Greeks fighting among themselves. Otto (pp. 35 f., 90 f.) protests against these

ius (xxix. 27. 8) would be better interpreted as indicating that the time limit was arranged between Popilius and Antiochus after the latter had submitted.

<sup>88</sup> If such insubordination seems incredible in a Roman, it will be well to recall the conduct, not only of Marcus, but also of Popilius' friend and successor, C. Cassius Longinus, consul in 171. Furious at being given Italy as his province while his colleague, P. Licinius Crassus, won the coveted Macedonian command, Cassius invaded Illyria from Cisalpine Gaul, without permission and with very little preparation, hoping to reach Macedonia by this route and defeat Perseus before Crassus arrived. When the senate was told what he had done, it declared the report "incredible," but it later learned to its indignation that the report was true. Nevertheless, when Cassius' victims complained that he had sold thousands of their people into slavery, the senators found ways to avoid punishing him (Livy xliii. 1; 5 [annalistic]).

<sup>89</sup> This ultimatum and the circle drawn with a stick in the sand outside which Antiochus might not step until he had given an answer form one of the most frequently cited episodes in Roman history. A dozen ancient writers tell the story.

<sup>90</sup> He was consul for the second time in 158; his son was consul in 132, conducting the reign of terror that followed the murder of Tiberius Gracchus and being exiled by the younger Gracchus in 123; his grandson was exiled for *perduellio* in 106; and two generations later, in 43, another Popilius Laenas murdered Cicero, who had once defended him when charged with parricide.

<sup>88</sup> Livy xliii. 8. 4-7 (annalistic); 17. 2 (Polyb.); cf. Polyb. xxviii. 13. 11.

<sup>89</sup> Livy xliii. 17. 10; 22. 2-8.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.* xlv. 29. 1-4.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.* xlv. 10. 2 f.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.* xlv. 10. 7-15. Popilius' visit to Rhodes certainly took place independently of the senate's discussion mentioned by Polyb. xxix. 19 and Livy xlv. 3. 3-8. Livy xlv. 10. 8 (Polyb.) says that at Rhodes Popilius was a *vir asper ingenio*.

<sup>93</sup> Otto believes (p. 81) that this *senatus consultum* was not the one reported by Livy but a formal ultimatum setting a time limit before which Antiochus must leave Egypt. The words of Livy (xlv. 12. 7) and Polyb-

charges in their extreme form; yet he speaks repeatedly of Rome's *Machiavellismus* and her *ungewöhnlich perfide Politik*, and he is very sharp-eyed when it comes to discovering plots to make the Greeks fight each other.<sup>97</sup> The theory cannot be argued at length here. It is perfectly true that Popilius was not unique in his gangsterism. The Romans often showed great brutality in their conquests; their generals paraded huge quantities of loot in their triumphs; the tax called *tributum* was not levied on Roman citizens after 167. But it does not follow that the Greek world was bankrupted by Roman looting. This world was already bankrupt, largely because of wars in which Rome had no part. The indemnity of fifteen thousand talents imposed upon Antiochus III after Magnesia was only a fraction of the cost of the war; and the total cost of this war was slight when compared to that of the wars he had been waging almost uninterruptedly for thirty years against Greeks and orientals. The fact that Antiochus could send only ten thousand men into Greece in 192 shows that he was already bankrupt. Moreover, after this indemnity was paid, Rome got nothing more from either Syria or Egypt for more than a hundred years; yet this was the century of their great decline. And, finally, the destruction caused by invading armies was slight when com-

pared to that caused by native revolts, such as those in Palestine under Judas Maccabaeus or in Egypt under Petosarapis. Syria and Egypt were destroyed, not by the Romans, but by the orientals.

It is, of course, impossible to generalize about Rome's policy from one instance. There are, however, two further facts which Rome's critics often neglect. For many years before and after 168 Cato was one of Rome's leading statesmen, and his strong opposition to eastern adventures is well known. And, secondly, during the period after 168 Rome maintained no fleet capable of operating in eastern Mediterranean waters,<sup>98</sup> which is strong evidence that the senate had no intention of intervening in eastern affairs. On the other hand, the factors which we have noticed in this paper—ignorance of eastern conditions, constant importunities for aid, a desire to preserve the peace by "freezing the *status quo*," and an occasional gangster in office—explain much more than do desire for loot and the principle *divide et impera*. It was against the will of the Roman people that circumstances gradually forced Rome to police the world; but when the Greek states collapsed one by one, having been undermined by the oriental revival and bled by their mutual wars, Rome happened to be on hand to seize the inheritance. Her presence there, however, was not due to her intrigues: Polybius was more nearly right when he attributed it to Fortune.

#### UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

<sup>97</sup> A striking example of Otto's tendency to find plots in whatever the Romans did may be seen on p. 89, where he accuses Popilius of deliberately continuing the double kingship in Egypt in the hope that quarrels between the brothers would make Roman domination easier. The only evidence for this theory is that Popilius advised the brothers to live in harmony! Otto nowhere suggests the possibility that Popilius refrained from reorganizing the whole government of Egypt because it never occurred to him to do so, or because it was not mentioned in his instructions, or because it would not lead to the type of "glory" in which he was interested. If we are to take this complete nonintervention as a form of intervention, it is, of course, easy to see intervention everywhere. On p. 67 Otto suggests that Jason's revolt in Palestine was caused primarily by Roman intrigue; other alleged cases of Roman interference are equally absurd.

<sup>98</sup> After Magnesia the Romans let their fleet run down and had trouble collecting transports in 171; after Pydna they again neglected it and, though they may have kept a few warships on hand, they had no fleet that could operate in the East; at the time of Aristonicus' revolt in Asia Minor (133) they lost much valuable time in building transports, and again, forty-five years later, Sulla had to scrape together a navy as best he could. Not until the days of Augustus did the Romans maintain a navy comparable to those of the Hellenistic states of the third and early second centuries (see Chester G. Starr, Jr., *The Roman Imperial Navy, 31 B.C.—A.D. 324* [Ithaca, 1941], chap. i).

## HAD THE DANAID TRILOGY A SOCIAL PROBLEM?

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY

IN A recent review<sup>1</sup> of George Thomson's *Aeschylus and Athens*, Professor Gilbert Norwood finds Professor Thomson's preconceived views resulting in sheerly fantastic judgments of Aeschylus. He says, however, that the book contains good things and in his final paragraph states:

Above all, one substantial part at least of the book has first-rate merit—the disquisition on the *Supplices*, where Professor Thomson's sociology is very much to the purpose and joins with his questing intelligence to produce a lucid and novel account of this difficult play, which proves to rest not only on moral but also on economic and social ideas. His suggestions, too, concerning the lost plays belonging to this trilogy, especially *Hypermnestra's* trial and acquittal, possess charm and deep importance.

Like Professor Norwood, I find many "good things" and much valuable and stimulating discussion in Professor Thomson's sociology, in spite of the wrongheadedness of some of his statements; but I cannot agree with Professor Norwood's praise of the disquisition on the *Supplices* and the lost plays of the Danaid trilogy. Much of Professor Thomson's sociological argument here appears to me evasive and mistaken.

Thomson renews the theory of Ridge-way<sup>2</sup> that in the *Supplices* Aeschylus is discussing the question of marriage within or without the family, of endogamy and exogamy. He holds that to "Aeschylus living in the heyday of ancient democracy, the subjugation of women was not only just, but preferable to the liberty which they had formerly enjoyed"; and, further, that in the final play the "institution of

matrimony, involving the subordination of the woman to the man, is formally established." Professor Thomson asserts that the reason that this interpretation of the play has not been generally accepted lies in the fact that other scholars hold aloof from social problems and are disconcerted<sup>3</sup> to find a great poet devoting his art to a theme apparently so unpoetical as the status of women in contemporary society, but, he adds, the fault lies in themselves.

In determining that the plot of the *Supplices* turns on the objection of the Danaids to what they consider incestuous marriage, Professor Thomson makes two pronouncements: (1) that "in fleeing from Egypt to Argos, the daughters of Danaos are plainly seeking to avoid their obligations"<sup>4</sup> and (2) that "the heiress must marry her father's next-of-kin."<sup>5</sup>

This, he says, is the legal aspect, viewed in that light by the contemporary audience, and the light in which the dramatist has been at pains to present the dispute.<sup>6</sup> The moral aspect is that Aeschylus advocates the subordination of women,<sup>7</sup> in the interest of private ownership of property: "The social basis of his moral judgments is exceptionally clear."

But it must be noted that neither of Professor Thomson's premises is true without limitation. Aeschylus himself has stated in the person of Danaos the exact legal facts, according to Attic law, about the departure from Egypt. Danaos speaks

<sup>1</sup> But Gilbert Murray long ago showed that another great Greek poet concerned himself with this problem.

<sup>2</sup> Thomson, p. 302. Professor Thomson understands these obligations to follow Attic law, to which he refers throughout in his argument.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 303.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 302.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 306.

<sup>1</sup> *CP*, XXXVII (1942), 437-41.

<sup>2</sup> *Early Age of Greece*, II, 25 ff.



with anger of the attempt of the cousins to marry his daughters illegally. The father's words are clear, unlike the wild outbursts of his daughters, who speak in high excitement and sometimes *αἰνγματικῶς* (vs. 464).

In his second speech to his daughters (vss. 222 ff.), who are huddling about the altars, he compares them to "a flock of doves, cowering in fear of hawks of the same plumage, hostile kinsmen who defile the race." He explains this last phrase, *μυιόντων τὸ γένος*, in his next words. "For how could a bird that has eaten a bird be pure? And how could one taking an unwilling bride from an unwilling father be free from stain?"

Words of strong religious import are employed by Danaos in denouncing the suitors, *μάλινω, ἀγνός, ἀγνέω*. He continues: "Not even when dead and in Hades' realm could such a sinner escape the guilt of his mad act if he succeeded in his attempt."

Danaos is not speaking of incest, but of the madness of the next of kin who by Athenian law have no rights over the girls while their father lives and none after his death, unless their claim has been submitted to a hearing before the archon and decided in their favor. What Danaos says of the madness of the attempt to force the marriage is fully supported by the Attic law by which a father has the right to give his daughters in marriage to the man of his own choice,<sup>8</sup> not necessarily to one who is next of kin. For a relative to attempt to marry a girl by force while her father is living is an act of *ἔβρις* and against *δικη*. The attempt of the suitors is often characterized as such in this drama. The Danaids themselves describe the attempt of the cousins as *ἀσεβής* (vs. 91) and *ὦν θέμις εἶργει* (vs. 371), "impious" and "forbidden by Right," in words that are equivalent to those used by their father.

<sup>8</sup> Isaeus x. 13: *ἐὰν τῷ βούληται*; ix. 29: *ὅτε θέλει αὐτῷ*.

Professor Thomson<sup>9</sup> evades the point of Attic law involved in the words *ἄκοντος πατέρα* (vs. 227) and criticizes as "invalid" Vürtheim's statement that, since the father is still living, the Danaids are not yet *ἐπικληροί* in the legal sense. Thomson's argument that women whose fathers were still living were sometimes called *epikleroi* is quite irrelevant to the question of the father's absolute authority over his daughters, whom he could give in marriage or leave by will to the man whom he chose for them.<sup>10</sup> No man had a right to marry an heiress until he had put in a claim at law (*ἐπιδικάζεσθαι*) and had her legally assigned to him. Legitimate brothers (or a surviving grandfather)<sup>11</sup> succeeded to the father's duty of providing a dowry and giving the daughter in marriage. The estate went not to the heiress but with her, and her male children inherited. If Danaos married his daughters outside the clan (as according to the legend<sup>12</sup> he later did marry all but two of them), the Egyptian cousins would be balked in their design to get the estate, which the children of the Danaids would inherit. This fact explains the indecent and violent haste of the suitors. They desired to get possession of the daughters of Danaos before they should marry and bear children to others.<sup>13</sup> An heiress married to a nonrelative could be claimed after her father's death by the next of kin, but, as her rights in the estate accrued to her children by her former marriage, there would be no

<sup>9</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 450.

<sup>10</sup> Dem. xxvii. 5 (Demosthenes' mother was left by will to Aphobos and his sister to Demophon); Dem. xxxvi. 8; Is. x. 13: "The law ordains that a father may if he has no sons bequeath his property as he chooses, provided he gives his daughters with the estate."

<sup>11</sup> Dem. xlv. 49.

<sup>12</sup> Pindar *Pyth.* 9. 112 ff.; Apollodorus ii. 1. 4; Paus. iii. 12. 2.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Is. viii. 31 for the fact that control of the estate went to the children of the heiress, not to the next of kin. Also [Dem.] xlv. 20.



pecuniary advantage for a relative in taking her from her husband. The next of kin became the legal protector of an unmarried heiress after her father's death, and he must either marry her himself (if not in the direct line of descent, i.e., a full brother) or give her in marriage. He could and frequently did fail to marry the heiress<sup>14</sup> for one reason or another.

Therefore, Professor Thomson's categorical statement that "the heiress must marry her next of kin" is subject to the following limitations:

1. The heiress is not obliged to marry her next of kin in her father's lifetime.
2. Her father may marry his daughter to anyone whom he chooses without consulting the next of kin. The husband chosen by the father may or may not belong to the family. The children of the marriage have all rights to the property on coming of age.
3. The heiress was not obliged to marry her next of kin if he refused to put in a claim for her.<sup>15</sup>

The king (vss. 387 ff.) suggests that if the suitors adduce some Egyptian law which gives them, as next of kin, power to dispose of the Danaids, then the Danaids must defend themselves according to the laws at home, i.e., in Egypt, and show that the cousins have no rights (*κῦρος*) over them. This indicates that the king does not know the Egyptian law, but it does not imply that the Attic law allows next of kin to usurp the rights of a living father.

Professor Thomson regards the corrupt verse 337 as decisive for the motives of the Danaids and prefers the emended reading *ὠνοῖτο* ("buy") to the emended *ὀνοῖτο* ("blame") preferred by Gilbert Murray, Vürtheim, and others.

What the Danaids really are saying in this textually corrupt verse is almost any-

body's guess;<sup>16</sup> but Professor Thomson, in my opinion, errs in his interpretation "Who would buy a kinsman to be her master," through his zeal to have the Danaids argue against endogamy. He translates *φίλους* "relatives." It is true that *φίλος* in the proper and clear context, or when joined with *οἰκεῖος*, sometimes refers to relatives, but it is singularly inappropriate for the cousins here. The king says: "Do you speak in hatred, or do you mean that it is against right?" The word *φίλους* clearly responds to *κατ' ἐχθραν*, in a similar position in the line before. I think that Gilbert Murray's translation is perhaps the right one. Reading *ὀνοῖτο* he translates: "Doth woman dread the yoke of one she loves?"

Verse 339, though not corrupt, is as troublesome and obscure as verse 337. I do not agree with Tucker and Thomson in their translation of *ἀπαλλαγῇ* by "divorce" and in their inference that the Danaids would be left defenseless if divorced by one of their own family. The law required that the heiress divorced for any reason but adultery should go with her dowry to her nearest relative.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, an heiress was under the protection of the archon<sup>18</sup> and anyone who chose was allowed to defend her rights.

In no other passage in Aeschylus does *ἀπαλλαγῇ* mean "divorce." It is always joined with a genitive and means "release from." Gilbert Murray and Vürtheim understand the verse in this way. Murray's translation is: "And from our troubling give you quick release!"

Vürtheim's<sup>19</sup> comment and translation is: "Schnippisch antworten die Mädchen, 'stimmt! und Ihr werdet nach diesem wohlgemeinten Prinzip leicht unser los.'"

<sup>14</sup> With the reading *ὠνοῖτο* the meaning, I think, would be, "Can one love masters whom one buys?"

<sup>15</sup> Is. ii. 7-9. Dem. lvii. 40 f.

<sup>16</sup> [Dem.] xliii. 54; Dem. lvii. 40 f.; Is. iii. 46-48.

<sup>17</sup> *Schutzstehende*, p. 183.

<sup>14</sup> Is. x. 12 ff.; vii. 11; [Dem.] xliiv. 10; Andoc. *Myst.* 119.

<sup>15</sup> [Dem.] xliii. 54.

It occurs to me that the verse might mean, as a retort to the king, "Yes, and an easy way out of difficulties," δυστυχούντων being taken (with Tucker) as neuter. But I am by no means sure of this. I believe, however, that Tucker and Thomson are not justified in their inferences from their translation of ἀπαλλαγή as "divorcee."

Gilbert Murray<sup>20</sup> holds that the principle of the *Supplikes* is that virginity is more precious than life, that violation is an indelible infamy. W. Schmid<sup>21</sup> says that the Danaid trilogy is the only extant drama by Aeschylus which has no "theologisch-weltanschauliches Problem" in its foreground. In the trilogy, Schmid thinks, we have only dramatic development to a certain goal given (in the tradition) as fated. According to Schmid, it would be impossible for each of the fifty Danaids to cherish a dislike for her individual suitor; Aeschylus therefore was compelled to look for a common denominator and found it in the type of the "anaphrodisic virago,"<sup>22</sup> which already existed in the legends, represented by the goddesses Artemis and Athena and by the heroines Atalanta, Cyrene, and others. He holds that the Danaids are actuated by a natural frigidity and hatred of men, and he understands αὐτογενεὶ φυξανορία (vs. 8) in that sense, as does Gilbert Murray, who translates verses 8 f.

A shrinking of the flesh inborn  
From man's touch.

This, I think, is not the right meaning. I agree with Tucker, who sees that αὐτογενής here has its usual meaning of "spontaneous, of one's own impulse," and is contrasted with ψήφω πόλεως in the preceding verse. Tucker rightly translates, "no ban-

ishment from bloodshed, decreed by the state, but an exile of our own making."

The Danaids are the heroic type of women who appear in the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles, but I do not think that Aeschylus pictured them as "anaphrodisic Amazons." What happened in Egypt we are not told, but it was enough to fill the girls with horror at the thought of marrying their cousins and, as their outeries sometimes suggest, with shrinking from any marriage. It is their emotion in their recoil from the ὕβρις of their suitors that makes this lyric drama, in which action is so slight. In this drama Aeschylus is doing something far greater than expounding the theme of the social status of women. He is putting on the stage, for the first time in our knowledge of drama, women throbbing with life, with their wild outbursts of emotion, their passionate determination, desperate cunning, and power over men in their helplessness. In their strength of character they are youthful and as yet guiltless Clytemnestras. Deeply religious in their prayers to the gods and at the same time not shrinking from the thought of polluting the altars by hanging themselves on them, they are neither saints nor sinners, but Aristotelian heroines "like ourselves."<sup>23</sup> Their father represents Attic law, protector of the family, sternly threatening with punishment in the lower world those who offend against it. Pelasgus represents the Greek state, Greek humanity, democracy; and love of country. The story of the Danaids is told in brief by Prometheus<sup>24</sup> without blame for their flight from their cousins, whose pursuit of them is condemned (ὁ θηρασίμους). In the second play of the trilogy the bridegrooms were murdered by the Danaids. Prometheus suggests the ritual pollution incurred by their deed when he says that Hypermnestra, soft-

<sup>20</sup> *The Supplikes of Aeschylus*, pp. 25 f.

<sup>21</sup> Schmid-Stählin, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, II, 202.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 195 f., n. 2.

<sup>23</sup> *Poetics* 1453a, ὁμοιορ.

<sup>24</sup> *PV*, 854-69.

ened by love, spared her bedfellow, preferring to be called a coward rather than one defiled by bloodshed (*μυαιφθὸς*).

Though the Danaids are dramatically protagonists in the *Supplices*, the legal struggle is between their father, who represents the law, and the cousins, infringers of that law. Professor Thomson, while insisting on the legal aspects of the *Supplices*, ignores the law when he says that the struggle between the Danaids and their suitors was a struggle between two rights, one old and one new. But under both systems, exogamy and endogamy, the right to choose the daughter's husband rested with the father. In a famous story of an exogamous marriage Herodotus<sup>25</sup> tells of Cleisthenes of Sicyon in the sixth century choosing from all Greece a husband for his daughter Agariste.

H. D. F. Kitto<sup>26</sup> remarks that it is natural to feel impatient with juristic arguments about the legal status of the Danaids in Argos. It may be thought an equal waste of time to discuss the Attic legal status of the Danaids in the matter of their marriage, but by this question Professor Thomson's social interpretation of the *Supplices* stands or falls. Aeschylus is either making a social study of the contemporary status of women in Athens, based on this old legend, or he is writing a drama, not about heiresses, but about tragic girls, caught in the net of circumstance and brought by dreadful suffering to commit dreadful deeds. In the second play of the trilogy they are murderesses; in the one which we have they are girls driven to desperation by the brutality of their would-be lovers. They have the sympathy of everyone in the drama (except the Egyptian herald), and they must have had the sympathy of the audiences before whom the play was performed. They do not secure the sympathy of W.

Schmid,<sup>27</sup> who believes that Aeschylus could not have known such women from his own experience and that he has made them still more unwomanly and abnormal than they were in the legend, in order to give psychological motivation for their deeds. According to Schmid, Aeschylus' sympathies were given to the soft and yielding type of women; but, since this passive sort offered no possibility of development dramatically, they play a negligible role in his dramas.

But the women of Greece were not all of the "feminine" type commended by Pericles, and Aeschylus may well have known, even in Athens, women of bolder impulses. In his dramas both heroes and heroines are, as Cornford<sup>28</sup> said, on a plane above that of realistic characters, such as the Watchman and the Nurse. Cornford says of Agamemnon that he is not so much a man as a single state of mind. The Danaids, too, in the *Supplices* express the single terrified state of mind of girls who have undergone the horrid experience of being attacked by men whom they hate. This state of mind is neither unwomanly nor abnormal—rather, indeed, both womanly and normal.

Moreover, it is not possible to divide Greek women sharply between the "Kinder, Kirche, und Küche" type and the "unfeminine" type. The Danaids, doubtless, in the end made as good wives and mothers as any other ladies of the heroic age.

I maintain, then, that the problem of the Danaid trilogy is dramatic and not a social problem, and that the question is "What happened to the Danaids?" not that of the contemporary (with Aeschylus) social status of Athenian women. In the Greek drama women played a great part, and the titles of many of Aeschylus'

<sup>27</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 281.

<sup>28</sup> *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, pp. 143 ff.

<sup>25</sup> *Hdt.* vi. 126-30.

<sup>26</sup> *Greek Tragedy*, p. 16.

dramas show how often they were his theme. The men in the audiences must have reflected on the women in their own homes when they saw the stage heroines and heard the comments on women's character that were uttered. They knew, as Professor Thomson says, the Attic law, and they knew that according to that law the suitors were committing an outrage (*ὑβρις*) against a father's rights.

Professor Thomson says that, in accordance with his interpretation of the first play of the trilogy, the last play, the *Danaids*, ended with the justification at law of the daughter who chose to cleave to her husband rather than to obey her father and with the formal establishment of the institution of matrimony, involving the subordination of the woman to the man.

It appears from Apollodorus<sup>29</sup> that the marriage of Hypermnestra to Lynceus was finally confirmed by Danaos. The other daughters, except Amymone, were given by their father to suitors who raced for them in a foot-race. This story is told by Pindar in the ninth Pythian ode, which is dated in 474 B.C., and this story of the foot-race for the Danaids is nearly as old as the *Supplices*<sup>30</sup> and may derive from it.<sup>31</sup> Danaos, then, has in the other plays of the trilogy the rights of a father which he claims in the *Supplices*, and the subordination of women, already recognized in the *Supplices*, could hardly have been established in the last play by the acquittal of Hypermnestra.

All that remains of the third play is the

<sup>29</sup> *Bibl. H.* 1. 5.

<sup>30</sup> Vürtheim (*op. cit.*, p. 81), dates the *Supplices* as late as 476 B.C., doubtless far too late.

<sup>31</sup> Pindar and Aeschylus frequently got suggestions from one another.

famous speech of Aphrodite in which she tells of the universality of love in nature, evidently defending Hypermnestra's yielding to that passion. The trial of Hypermnestra was certainly the great scene of the *Danaids*, but it is likely that the fate of the other sisters was also settled in the play and that their purification from bloodshed and their marriage to successful runners for their hands were in some way told. Otherwise the title *Danaids* would not be appropriate.

Vürtheim in his edition of the *Supplices* (pp. 21-24) refuted Dümmler's treatment of the trilogy as an *epikleros*-question. Dümmler's legal theory of the *Supplices* coincides with that of Professor Thomson. Since the latter gives<sup>32</sup> an incomplete and unsatisfactory account of Vürtheim's arguments, I offer this discussion of the allusions to Athenian law and social customs in the *Supplices* in the conviction that Professor Thomson's deep interest in social problems has misled him in his interpretation of the Danaid trilogy.

The *Supplices* is the most archaic Greek tragedy which we possess. It gives a few hours of dramatic emotion in the life of the terrified Danaids, who have just escaped from the *ὑβρις* of their suitors in Egypt. Aeschylus presents the heroines as tragic girls, not as heiresses. The aim of the suitors may have been the chance of succeeding to the throne of Argos, but we are not told of this in the play. The audience was doubtless interested in the points of law suggested, but Aeschylus gives us, not the solving of a legal problem, but a *κάθαρσις* through fear and pity.

VASSAR COLLEGE

<sup>32</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 450.

## ACCELERATION OF LANGUAGE TEACHING AND THE CLASSICS

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING

I MUST approach my subject in what will seem a roundabout way. Ordinarily it is, in my opinion, labor lost to talk about the flaws of a review; but the review<sup>1</sup> of Bloch and Trager's *Outline of Linguistic Analysis*,<sup>2</sup> signed J. Whatmough, seems an exception to this rule. It opens—irrelevantly enough—with statements which might easily lead a reader to conclude that the Linguistic Society of America, the American Council of Learned Societies Devoted to Humanistic Studies, and the government of the United States have all combined to put across a preposterous swindle. Evidently, either that situation is—to use the reviewer's phraseology—"tragic and potentially disastrous to us all," or the charge is "comic."

The offense hinted at is the Intensive Language Program of the Council,<sup>3</sup> the "current claims" for which are termed by the reviewer "grandiose and specious nonsense." The broadest and, to my mind, sufficient reply is: the leaders in the work are well known; they are too honorable to be parties to any swindle, too wise and too versed in the subject matter of their science to be victims of any self-delusion concerning it. Still, let us examine in some detail the two counts of the indictment.

It is first alleged that workers under the Program claim "that a man who has had about six months' acquaintance with

a language on these methods will pretend to teach it." This is simply a grotesque distortion of the facts. The claim actually made is that a linguist, even though he has had no acquaintance with a language, can be most helpful in guiding students who are striving to learn a language from one who speaks it as his mother-tongue; and that if the linguist has had an acquaintance with a language *sufficient to enable him to make a proper description of it*, he can take a more active part in the work—he can then, with the use of a native speaker as informant, teach the language to the students instead of learning it along with them.<sup>4</sup>

That is something very different, and I can testify to the merits of the claim; for I was a beneficiary of the method when it was still in embryo. Some twenty years ago Leonard Bloomfield and I went without lunch<sup>5</sup> twice a week in order to meet a Greek informant. I was not particularly interested in learning Modern Greek; but I knew in a general way of Bloomfield's field work in Tagalog and Menomini, and I was most anxious to see how he would set about learning a new language. I was a bad student, and my teacher neglected me. Either he was shy about giving directions to a man of my age; or, not realizing how thoroughly I was dominated by tradition, he took it for granted that I knew much that I did not know. The result was that my work was far from intensive—practically nil outside of class. Still, when

<sup>1</sup> *Class. Phil.*, XXXVIII, No. 3 (July, 1943), 210 f.

<sup>2</sup> Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1942.

<sup>3</sup> For a description of it cf. Edgar H. Sturtevant, "The Intensive Language Program and the Teaching of Latin," *Classical Weekly*, XXXVII (1943), 15 f.; also his review of Bloch and Trager and the article by Mary R. Haas, both cited below.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Mary R. Haas, "The Linguist as a Teacher of Languages," *Language*, XXIX, No. 3 (July-September, 1943), 203-8.

<sup>5</sup> This is mentioned to show how pressed for time we were.



after two months we had to stop, I was pleasantly surprised by the returns on my very small investment and amazed at the progress Bloomfield had made. I look back on those weeks as on one of the happiest and most valuable experiences of my life, and certainly I should consider it a waste of time to attempt to learn any modern language in any other way.

The other allegation made by the reviewer is that it is claimed "that students who have had only eight weeks' instruction are to be judged successful speakers." This seems a gross exaggeration. Of course, I do not know what rumors are current in Cambridge, but in recent conversations with workers at New Haven I heard nothing of the sort. They talked of months, not weeks, and I was somewhat surprised that their claims were so much less than what I was prepared to accept as reasonable.<sup>6</sup>

Early in his discussion of the pamphlet the reviewer voices a suspicion "that a linguist is something different from what [he] had believed."<sup>7</sup> That is, he is troubled at finding "linguist" used where he would prefer some other word—no doubt, "philologist." I dislike such a use of "philologist," but that is at present irrelevant.<sup>8</sup> Here are to be noted two things: (1) the reviewer's belief that everybody except the authors says "linguist" only where he says it and (2) his belief that the word *must* be used in the situations in which he uses it and in no other situation.

The first raises a question of fact to which I shall devote but little time. One has heard and can still hear utterances

<sup>6</sup> Cf. also the very interesting and sensible remarks about the teaching of Burmese at Yale, in *Time*, October 18, 1943, p. 73.

<sup>7</sup> Actually he says "we"; but I cannot join him in imputing such an outlook to the readers of *Classical Philology*.

<sup>8</sup> My reasons are implicit in an article, "Linguistics and Philology," in *Language*, V (1929), 27-32.

such as: "So-and-so is a great linguist; he speaks  $n$  languages and  $3n$  dialects." I shall label this the "polyglot" meaning. According to the *New English Dictionary* it was in 1903 the only meaning not obsolete in England. What changes may have occurred there in the next twenty-five years I have not attempted to determine; but in 1928 was held the First International Congress of Linguists. Its organizers were, to be sure, Continental Europeans, but men who had learned their English in England. They were confronted by a dilemma: either they had to forego their wish to issue the circulars in English or they had to revive a more or less obsolete meaning of "linguist" as "a scientist whose subject-matter is language."<sup>9</sup> They chose the latter alternative, and it is to be noted that they encountered no difficulty either then or when they so used the word before the Congress.<sup>10</sup> Nor does any seem to have been felt by the Philological Society (London) in sending delegates to the Congress. Sir Richard Paget so used the word before the Second Congress (1931), and A. H. Gardiner did the same before the Third (1933). The *Shorter Oxford Dictionary* was evidently behind the times when it continued to mark the meaning as obsolete. In America there can be no question of obsolescence. As far back as 1924 Funk and Wagnalls recorded the meaning, and since then examples of it are plentiful. To be sure, many educated Americans are still left ignorant of the existence of such a science as linguistics. Of course, they have no use for "linguist" as the designation of a scientist. This is a feature in which various social dialects differ and might after a proper survey be recorded as such; but

<sup>9</sup> Bloch and Trager's description of this meaning.

<sup>10</sup> No use of English by a native speaker is recorded in the *Actes* of the First Congress. On its organization cf. H. Pedersen, *Litteris*, V, 153.

to go further in imitation of the British dictionaries is careless workmanship.

The second point is more interesting, because it reveals that the reviewer is somewhat naïvely under the domination of words. For linguists words are merely arbitrary symbols. As Bloch and Trager—who are admitted to be helpful “for weaker brethren”—put it: “It is important to remember that words are only symbols, not somehow mystically identical with the objects and events they symbolize.” The reviewer will have none of this. He has always believed a linguist to be a polyglot; and so a linguist is and must be a polyglot. When Bloch and Trager very carefully—and very patiently—explain that they mean by the term “linguist” not a polyglot, but a “scientist whose subject-matter is language,” he is puzzled and confused.

His first reaction is to pounce upon this as being somehow an admission that these linguists know no languages. Yet, Meletus-like, he does not believe his own interpretation: “The authors, I know, their assertions notwithstanding, do know some languages.” Later he evolves another solution: all linguists are polyglots, but not all polyglots are linguists. The term is to be restricted<sup>11</sup> to such polyglots as (1) can speak fluently “a very large number of languages of different types”; (2) have a “systematic knowledge” of these languages—probably a familiarity with their traditional descriptions; and (3) possess an “efficient way of thinking” about various problems—probably what Whitney (cf. below) calls “acuteness and erudition in etymological investigations.”

A couple of parallels may help to an appreciation of this attitude. Suppose a

more widely recognized science were under discussion. An Englishman with a similar outlook might speak somewhat as follows: “A chemist? A chemist is a man who sells medicinal drugs. You say he is a scientist whose subject matter is the interaction of pure substances. That can’t be right; it would make a chemist something different from what we have believed. No! a chemist *is* a man who sells medicines. Only, he must (1) have lots of medicines to sell; (2) mix them just as the doctor orders; and (3) possess an effective way of talking about shaving creams, tooth pastes, and those kinds of things. That’s what a chemist *is*.” To take a case from real life. Some years ago a bridge-player said to an opponent, “Madam, the lead is in the other hand.” At once she called the director of the tournament and complained that she had been insulted: “He called me *madam*, and I know what a madam is!” The attitude of any one of the three is as naïve as either of the others.

I dwell upon this attitude of the reviewer because it seems significant. There are things that some polyglots may do but which just aren’t done in the world of linguists. The importance of the difference is brought out by Whitney.<sup>12</sup> Students who have enjoyed only “the ordinary training in the classical or the modern languages or in both” should not be plunged immediately into what was then called “comparative philology.” Unless first given a training in linguistics, they may, among other disadvantages, even come “to combine with acuteness and erudition in etymological investigations views respecting the nature of language and the relations of languages of a wholly crude or fantastic character.”

This is the severest arraignment of

<sup>11</sup> The restrictions are couched in a terminology to which I unfortunately find it difficult to attach precise meanings.

<sup>12</sup> In the Preface (pp. vii f. of his *Language and the Study of Languages* [London, 1867]).

traditional methods with which I am acquainted. A man may study five languages (English, Latin, Greek, French, and German) not for eight weeks, nor for six months, but from childhood to graduation and yet not learn the nature of language! Merely multiplying the languages studied will not change the situation. Polyglotticism of itself cannot make a linguist in the sense of a "scientist whose subject-matter is language."

Whitney had no need to give examples of what he meant by views of a wholly crude or fantastic character. A lifetime later it is still—most unfortunately—only too easy to find specimens he might have included. One need only read newspapers and magazines or listen to the talk of college graduates—even some in high academic places and possessed of "acuteness and erudition in etymological investigations." Indeed, it has been suggested that *Language* open a department of "Funnies" to be patterned after the "Americana" Mencken used to print. The objection comes not from a dearth of material but from the reluctance of linguists to cause pain. Looking upon words as anything but arbitrary symbols would surely be grist for that mill.

Another pounce of the reviewer's needs to be noticed. On page 8 Bloch and Trager call, not the technique of analysis, but the description of a language reached by it, the grammar of that language. The reviewer—somehow—concludes: "It is not necessary to read this pamphlet through with any great care in order to discover in what linguistic analysis differs from grammar, for on page 8 the admission is made that there is no difference." This time the reviewer does seem to believe himself and to have acted upon his belief. Careless, if any, reading is the kindest explanation that can be given for his sweeping "nothing new" condemna-

tion of the work. Contrast the verdict of Edgar Sturtevant on the first chapter: "Everyone who is not a linguist ought to read these pages, and all linguists will want to."<sup>13</sup> I would say as much for the whole book.

Another thing that just isn't done by linguists may be seen when the reviewer airs with pride his use of "phonematics," as if the fact could be of importance anywhere except possibly—but remotely so—in a history of the New England dialects. Like all other American linguists, the authors say "phonemics"; and the reviewer—somehow—concludes that "Greek is not one" of the languages they know. Does he really fancy that these young scholars coined the term? Or is it, in his opinion, the first duty of a scientist to schoolmaster the language of a science when entering upon its work?<sup>14</sup> Does he imagine that borrowings from one language to another all follow the most direct route? Is he ignorant of the history of this word?

I expected the reviewer to be familiar with "traditional grammar" and also with the fact that the phrase is used by linguists where less kindly men might speak of prescientific or even of Ptolemaic grammar. Then how are we to explain his dismissing as identical with traditional grammar a book which contains as its second chapter what Sturtevant calls "the clearest and most interesting account of general phonetics that I have ever seen"?<sup>15</sup> This applies with still more force to the chapter on phonemics, which is admirable both for its clarity and for its good sense. To assert that anything of the sort can be found in traditional gram-

<sup>13</sup> *Language*, XIX (1943), 43.

<sup>14</sup> I recall the citation of a French law that provided a fine for proposing to change a botanical term on the ground that it was not good Latin.

<sup>15</sup> I could say the same; but my testimony would add nothing, for my reading in phonetics is less wide than Sturtevant's.

mar is simply calling up men in buckram. Even wilder—if possible—is the assertion that “the treatment of morphology in particular is under the domination of traditional Indo-European and Latin grammar.” The basis of the authors’ analysis is that the forms of a language are to be classified, not by drawing philosophic distinctions among their meanings, but by sorting them out according to their morphologic and syntactic features. Whether that is traditional method does not admit of discussion.

The reviewer complains that he was disappointed by this “much-touted” book. The fault—it must be said—lies not in the introductory circulars but in himself. I got the book, found it to be precisely what its announcement had led me to expect, and read and reread it with enjoyment and profit. Just what sort of “revelation” the reviewer was looking for is not clear. An advance beyond Bloomfield as Bloomfield was an advance beyond Paul? A queer thing to expect from a manual to aid those who are entering upon the study of an unfamiliar language! If not this, then the reviewer’s failure to grasp the difference between a method of analysis and the description of a particular language leads one to wonder what he really did expect of the pamphlet. The authors show how any language can be analyzed by giving as a specimen of this sort of work a partial analysis of English. The criticism runs: “There are many languages the description of which cannot be fitted into this treatment of forms and syntax.” If that misty phrase means that there are many languages the forms and syntax of which cannot be treated by this method, it is untrue. If it means that the description of English forms and syntax resulting from this treatment does not fit the forms and syntax of many languages, it is a grievous

understatement. There is *no* other language which it could fit. A description that could fit every language would be a universal grammar, the hope for which in any immediate future was abandoned by linguists about the time of Waterloo. This or some approximation to it—a description to fit “many,” if not all, languages—seems most probably the hope that was disappointed. Or would the reviewer have been content had he been given as a specimen the analysis of some language—say Burushaski—“not of Indo-European or similar type”? That could have been done, had it been planned to make Burushaski a prerequisite.

The reviewer may possibly have had one valid ground for complaint, but he did not voice it and perhaps could not have been expected to do so. He had not understood Bloomfield’s *Language*, and he may—perhaps reasonably—have hoped that if its contents were presented to him in a simplified form he might be set on the way to understanding. To that extent the book has failed; the reviewer still cannot understand Bloomfield’s work. Otherwise he could not declare that it “rests upon a well-known but questionable psychological basis.”<sup>16</sup> Actually its basis is that psychology should be left to the psychologists, that linguists, *qua* linguists, are not competent to talk about psychological questions, that such talk is not needed from them, and that often it merely screens from themselves and others the shortcomings of their work.

The review, then, need not be taken too seriously. It will not, we may be sure, deprive our men in the Armed Forces of the best help available in their learning of languages which they must learn well and

<sup>16</sup> I must, *qua* linguist, leave to psychologists the implication that the reviewer works on a psychological basis that cannot be questioned by any psychologist. I should enjoy hearing a psychologist talk about that.

quickly. It will not stop the Council from continuing to push the Program, which is, in my opinion, the greatest advance yet offered in education. It will not reopen or widen (whichever is the better term) the rift between linguists and classical philologists. These are "potential disasters" that it seemed to threaten; but on examination they scatter like morning mists before the rising sun. The sun of progress will not stand still because Joshua bids it.

The ground is now clear for a discussion of my subject. It must start from the fact that, in the postwar world, classicists will be confronted by a vast improvement in the teaching of modern languages. The introduction of the new method will be delayed, no doubt, by inertia and by considerations of its cost. Still, that is the competition we must sooner or later face. We shall rejoice, of course, in the goodliness of our competitors, but what else are we to do about the improved competition? The answer, I think, is clear: we too must accelerate our teaching; that is, we must, in shorter time, get results as good as, or better than, those we are now getting.

Acceleration in the teaching of ancient languages is possible. I have taught Sanskrit faster than I learned it. My best pupils knew by Christmas more Greek than I knew in my second year. There are limits, no doubt; but I should not venture to set up the boundary marks. What I have done I do not regard as an achievement due to any personal ability of mine. On the contrary, I could name a man who—I am sure, though I have no proof—teaches Sanskrit faster than I taught it. I have no friend so close among the teachers of beginning Greek and cannot speak about it so directly. I can merely note that the best textbook plans to teach in a year more than I was taught in two; and that from my experience I be-

lieve that the best students can, under favorable circumstances, learn that much in a single quarter.

How we are to accelerate our teaching I shall not try to tell in detail. I am no believer in pedagogy. Teaching is like love-making. No man knows how another does it; *Kāma-sūtra*'s and treatises on educational psychology are both disappointing.

Some facts of a general nature do seem to stand out. The new method cannot be taken over bodily. Native informants are essential to it, and these are excluded by definition from the teaching of ancient languages. Nor will make-believe imitation serve. Neither linguist nor philologist—no matter how accomplished he may be—can replace the native informant. I have recently seen ascribed to John Mason Brown a saying: "The only rule for interesting people is to talk as well as you can about what interests you." It is the advice given me years ago by my great teacher, Maurice Bloomfield, and I would repeat it. To accelerate the teaching of a language you must be interested in the language itself. That and a knowledge of "the nature of language" are the chief things needed.<sup>17</sup> My best teaching was done in my last years. I was then in closest contact with linguistics; and, to speak more definitely, I ascribe my improvement to Leonard Bloomfield's *Language*. I have worked both as philologist and as linguist, and among my firmest convictions is a belief that each needs the aid of the other. Never more urgently than in the postwar world.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

<sup>17</sup> Another thing that might be mentioned is the need of devoting sufficient time to the study. One year of five hours per week is better than two years of three hours per week; while what is learned in the five-hour course would be much more than doubled if ten hours a week should be given to the subject. Compare the views of Sturtevant in the article cited above (n. 3).



## ELLIPSIS OF THE PRONOUN IN SENECA

BEN L. CHARNEY

MANY an emendator has been led astray by "grammatical conscience." A desire to mold all writers to the pattern of Cicero's style, or, rather, to the style of the Cicero who does not deviate from the rules of Ciceronian composition, has led to a neglect or disregard of the stylistic features of other authors.

In the writings of Seneca, for example, especially in the *Epistulae morales*, where brachylogical expression is natural to a popular and conversational style, the philosopher's fondness for ellipsis has often been overlooked. The result has more than once been unnecessary addition or correction. A study of the pronoun, or, rather, its omission, in Seneca's *Epistulae* will provide abundant proof of this fact.

### I. PERSONAL PRONOUNS

#### A. OBJECTS OF VERBS

The object pronoun is so frequently omitted in Seneca that it is surprising to find how often editors have sought to supply it.

This was the case, for instance, in *Ep.* 31. 2: "haec quae timenda est [vox] non ex uno scopulo sed ex omni terrarum parte circumsonat," where Aem. Baehrens proposed "<te> circumsonat." Hense<sup>1</sup> realized that this was unnecessary and compared *Ep.* 32. 2. Löfstedt<sup>2</sup> and Beltrami<sup>3</sup> further defend the omission on metrical grounds (double cretic as against spondee-

cretic). An alternative explanation may be that, while Seneca generally employs the verb *circumsonare* transitively (cf. *Ep.* 56. 1, 94. 55; *Dial.* ix. 1. 9; *Herc. furens* 417), he may here be employing it intransitively, as he apparently does in *Ep.* 49. 7 ("magno mihi animo strepitus iste belli circumsonantis exaudiendus est").<sup>4</sup>

A similar emendation based on mechanical paleographic grounds was proposed by Baehrens in *Ep.* 34. 2: "lente <te> ire." But here again the addition is not essential.

In *Ep.* 35. 1 the text reads: "Cum te tam valde rogo ut studeas, meum negotium ago: habere amicum volo, quod contingere mihi, nisi pergis ut coepisti excolere te, non potest." Hense follows a suggestion made by Linde<sup>5</sup> of adding *te* before *amicum*. But compare *Ep.* 24. 16 and 62. 2. Actually, the pronoun may be felt to carry over from the previous sentence, as is the case in *Ep.* 32. 2, 62. 2, 71. 28; *Dial.* x. 7. 7, xi. 7. 2; etc.

In *Ep.* 84. 11 it is the indefinite object pronoun that may be felt to carry over, so that we should read with Q: "tam sollicita [res] est [ambitus] ne quem ante se videat quam ne secum,"<sup>6</sup> rather than "... ne <quem> secum," along with cod. O and Hense.<sup>7</sup>

In this connection *Ep.* 122. 18 should also be considered: "quomodo cultu se a ceteris distingunt, quomodo elegantia cenarum munditiis vehiculorum, sic vo-

<sup>1</sup> The reference is to Otto Hense's 2d ed. (Leipzig: Teubner, 1914).

<sup>2</sup> Einar Löfstedt, "Zu Senecas Briefen," *Eranos*, XIV (1914), 152.

<sup>3</sup> Achille Beltrami. His first edition was published as follows: Vol. I (Brescia: Apollonia, 1916); Vol. II (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1927). His second edition was published in Rome (Typis regiae officinae polygraphicae, 1931).

<sup>4</sup> See also below, n. 13, for a different explanation.

<sup>5</sup> S. Linde, "Adversaria in Latinis scriptores," *Lunds Universitets Årsskrift*, XXXVI (1900), 13.

<sup>6</sup> So also Beltrami, with the approval of Giuseppe Albini in his review of Beltrami (in *Riv. filol.*, XLV [1917], 128).

<sup>7</sup> *Supplementum Quirinianum* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1921), p. xi.

lunt *separare etiam temporum dispositione*." The seeming harshness of the omission of the pronoun with *separare* has led to various emendations, such as "volunt *separari*" (Madvig,<sup>8</sup> Summers,<sup>9</sup> Castiglioni<sup>10</sup>), "volunt <se> *separare*" (Bartsch,<sup>11</sup> Cornelissen), and "<se> volunt *separare*" (Hense). But Madvig was probably right when he suggested, if somewhat hesitantly, the possibility that *se* might be understood from the preceding clause.

The omission of the object of the transitive verb where the reference is general occurs frequently;<sup>12</sup> cf., e.g., *Ep.* 8. 4, 11. 9, 39. 2, 75. 16, 81. 6, 90. 16, 106. 9; *Dial.* v. 39. 4, ix. 16. 2; etc.<sup>13</sup> Yet this has not rarely escaped the notice of editors.

Consider *Ep.* 47. 19: "non quicquid nos offendit, et laedit. sed ad rabiem cogunt pervenire deliciae." Quite unnecessarily most editors<sup>14</sup> read "<nos> cogunt" along with 5 and Macrobius. In the above case the force of *nos* of the preceding sentence may also be felt to carry over.

The postulation of a corrupt reading in *ducit* of *Ep.* 94. 43—"adeo etiam sine ratione ipsa veritas ducit"—has been resumed by Axelson,<sup>15</sup> although the need for emendation had been refuted by Hense,<sup>16</sup> who compares *Dial.* vi. 2. 1. Axelson bases his assumption of an error in the text on the lack of an object with *ducit* and pre-

fers to read Koch's *lucet*, comparing *Ep.* 115. 3 and *Ben.* ii. 25. 2, neither of which is particularly to the point. He himself betrays the unsoundness of his case when he concedes parenthetically that an object with *ducit* is not absolutely essential.

Again in *Ep.* 118. 8, on similar grounds, Axelson<sup>17</sup> would adopt Pincianus' *subrepi* for *subripit*: "at quod invitat ad se et adlice facit, veri simile est: subripit, sollicitat, adtrahit." But *subripit* no more requires an expressed object than do *sollicitat*, *adtrahit*, and the other verbs of the sentence.

#### B. SUBJECT OF INFINITIVE WHEN SAME AS THAT OF MAIN VERB

Such an omission, probably colloquial in origin,<sup>18</sup> is not uncommon in Seneca. The editors have often inserted the pronoun; but the omission, if such it properly is, occurs frequently enough for each case to find sufficient corroboration in the others.

Thus in *Ep.* 1. 4 Bourgery<sup>19</sup> is right in defending the reading of the principal manuscripts: "non possum dicere nihil perdere." Hense (2d ed.) inserts *me* before *dicere*; the *inferiores* add *me* either before or after *nihil*. But cf. *Ep.* 102. 18; *Dial.* vi. 12. 1, 13. 1, ix. 2. 7,<sup>20</sup> 10. 5,<sup>21</sup> x. 10. 5; *Ben.* ii. 6. 2,<sup>22</sup> vi. 40. 2,<sup>23</sup> vii. 26. 3; *Clem.* i. 1. 7,<sup>24</sup> ii. 1. 7.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 157, n. 35.

<sup>9</sup> See Draeger, II, 440, § 454; Kühner-Stegmann, II, Part I, 700 ff.; Stolz-Schmalz, p. 952.

<sup>10</sup> "Notes critiques sur le texte de Sénèque," *Rev. philol.*, XXXVII (1913), 104.

<sup>11</sup> "Nec dolent prava sed frustra voluisse," so Bourgery and one of the *inferiores*; *se*: A; *se sed*: Haase; Hermes.

<sup>12</sup> "Quoniam includi ex toto non patiuntur [voluptates] includi (se)" Koch, but Hermes rightly compares *Dial.* x. 14. 2.

<sup>13</sup> "Dedisse . . . oblitus est] (se) dedisse": G; "dedisse (se)": Gertz.

<sup>14</sup> "Quare obligatum moleste fers"] Bourgery; "moleste (te)": Gruter, Hosius, Préchac.

<sup>15</sup> "Haec confessio exprimitur, esse felices] esse (se)": Erasmus.

<sup>16</sup> "Quam [se. 'vocem'] . . . audisse memin[ ](me) memin[ ]": F. Gertz.

<sup>8</sup> Nic. Madvig, *Adv. crit.*, II, 513.

<sup>9</sup> Walter C. Summers, *Select Letters of Seneca* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1910).

<sup>10</sup> Luigi Castiglioni, "Studi Anneani III," *Studi ital. filol. class.*, II (new ser., 1922), 254.

<sup>11</sup> Julius Bartsch, "Zur Kritik der Briefe Senecas," *Rh. M.*, XXIV (1869), 287.

<sup>12</sup> See A. Bourgery, *Sénèque prosateur* (Paris: Société d'édition "Les belles lettres," 1922), p. 404.

<sup>13</sup> *Ep.* 31. 2, discussed above (p. 107), may possibly be included here.

<sup>14</sup> An exception is Summers, *op. cit.* Similar cases are *Dial.* ix. 16. 2 (Pfennig wished to supply *nos*) and x. 14. 2 (Gertz added *nos*).

<sup>15</sup> Bertil Axelson, *Neue Senecastudien* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1939), p. 202.

<sup>16</sup> "Zu Senecas Briefen," *Hermes*, LXII (1927), 110.

## C. SUBJECT OF INFINITIVE WHEN DIFFERENT FROM THAT OF MAIN VERB

Such omission occurs a number of times in Seneca. It is quite in keeping with the more colloquial style of the *Epistles*, although it is found not rarely in Seneca's other works as well (cf. *Ep.* 19. 11, 31. 5, 65. 6, 73. 12, 83. 27, 109. 18; *Dial.* vi. 9. 3, xi. 11. 2; *Ben.* i. 10. 5, iii. 27. 4, vii. 2. 6; *Clem.* i. 17. 3, etc.).

Accordingly, there is no need for supplementing *Ep.* 24. 16: "quod facere te moneo, scio certe fecisse." Yet Hense and Beltrami (1st ed.) followed the *inferiores* in adding *te* after *certe*. Castiglioni<sup>26</sup> inclines to the view that the pronoun may perhaps be rightly omitted; otherwise, he would read <te> *certe*. It must be admitted that the accidental loss by haplography (*certe te*) could easily have occurred, but the fact that the addition of *te* is a "natural correction" operates to some extent in favor of the *lectio difficilior* (that is, without *te*). The text as cited is clear and intelligible. The omission of the pronoun is quite in keeping with the colloquial style, and the *te* of the *quod* clause was probably felt to carry over. Th. Stangl<sup>27</sup> and Beltrami (2d ed.) rightly omit the pronoun.<sup>28</sup>

## II. DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

A not infrequent ellipsis is that of the antecedent of a relative pronoun in a case other than that of the relative (cf. *Ep.* 13. 7, 45. 10, 63. 16, 75. 17, 93. 2, 109. 9, 111. 1; *Dial.* ii. 10. 2, iv. 21. 6, v. 25. 1; *Clem.* i. 8. 1, ii. 6. 2, etc.).

Consequently, in *Ep.* 68. 11, where

<sup>26</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 219.

<sup>27</sup> Review of C. Brakman's *Ammianae et Annaeana* (Leyden: Brill, 1910), *Berl. philol. Wechnachr.*, XXX (1910), 1071.

<sup>28</sup> Löfstedt (*op. cit.*, p. 151) defends the reading of the manuscripts on metrical grounds; he regards "*certe fecisse*" as forming Kl. 1 (cretic-spondee), apparently treating the *te* of *certe* as an irrational long, although he nowhere in his article discusses or mentions "irrational" feet.

"cuius turbae par esse non possum, plus habet gratiae" is essentially the reading of the manuscripts, there was no reason for Hense to be disturbed to the point of obelizing the passage in his text, or for his later suggestion: "<ille,> cuius clientium turbae, eqs."<sup>29</sup> Cf., further, *Dial.* ii. 7. 4: "non minus latro est, cuius telum obposita veste elusum est."

Similarly, Bourguery rightly reads with A in *Dial.* v. 14. 6. In *Ben.* v. 1. 4, Gertz and Hosius unnecessarily supply the pronoun, and in *Ep.* 42. 8 Madvig<sup>30</sup> added a superfluous *eius*.

## III. INDEFINITE PRONOUNS

A. INDEFINITE PRONOUNS IN GENERAL SENTENCES<sup>31</sup>

Among instances of these ellipsis are *Ep.* 83. 18, 94. 51, 101. 12, 105. 8; *Dial.* i. 2. 6, ii. 5. 5 (ii. 5. 4 [Hermes]), iv. 28. 5, 33. 4,<sup>32</sup> v. 24. 4, 25. 2, ix. 1. 11, 17. 1, x. 7. 9,<sup>33</sup> *Ben.* i. 2. 3, ii. 14. 4, 33. 1, v. 14. 1, 14. 2, 20. 3, vii. 14. 4, 32, etc.

On the basis of the examples cited it is probable that in certain other cases as well, where editors read the second person singular, generally along with the *inferiores*, the indefinite third person of the principal manuscripts should be retained. Read, therefore, in *Ep.* 23. 1: "huius fundamentum quod sit quaeris? ne gaudeat vanis."<sup>34</sup> And, again, in *Ep.* 85. 18, there was no need for Hense (*app. crit.*) to feel inclined to the suggestion made by Koch:

<sup>29</sup> "Zu Senecas Briefen," *Rh. M.*, LXXIV (1925), 121.

<sup>30</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 477: "(elus) pro quo scribendum suspicor."

<sup>31</sup> See A. Uhl, *Quaestiones criticae in L. Annaei Senecae Dialogos* (Strassburg: Müh, 1898), p. 43; Draeger, I<sup>3</sup>, 101, § 50b; Kühner-Stegmann, II, Part I, 7.

<sup>32</sup> Unnecessarily emended by Fischer and Wesenberg.

<sup>33</sup> Wesenberg wished to add *aliquid*; but cf. J. Müller, *Sitzungsber. Akad. Wiss. Wien.*, CXVIII (1889), 32 f.

<sup>34</sup> Editors read *gaudeas* with G.

"eum qui virtutem habeat"<sup>35</sup> (for "cum virtutem habeat"),<sup>36</sup> which is the reading of some of the *inferiores* but quite a superfluous change.

In *Ep.* 74. 34 ("quas [miserias] optimum est differre si discutere non possit"),<sup>37</sup> Hense<sup>38</sup> would understand *animus* from the preceding paragraph with *possit* (but this is somewhat difficult), and Beltrami reads *possis*; both show oversight of the Senecan construction here involved.

Similarly, in *Ep.* 85. 36 ("deinde gubernatoris ars alienum est: ad eos quos vehit pertinet, quomodo medici ad eos quos curat; commune bonum est et eorum cum quibus vivit et proprium ipsis"), Hense supplies "est sapientis" before "est et eorum." However, Beltrami (*app. crit.*) is right, in my opinion, in understanding an indefinite pronoun (*quis* or *aliquis*) with *vivit*; as he points out, Seneca is drawing a distinction between "alienum bonum" and "commune bonum" in general, allowing the reader to make his particular applications.

#### B. OMISSION OF SUBJECT WITH *inquit*

In imitation of *φησὶ* of the Greek diatribe,<sup>39</sup> Seneca quite often employs *inquit* without subject to introduce an objection or a question. This usage apparently occurs first in Cicero and Varro, subsequently in Horace and Livy, often in Seneca, and occasionally in later writers.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>35</sup> H. A. Koch, "Zu Senecas Briefen," *Jahrb. Philol. u. Paedagog.*, CXI (1875), 721.

<sup>36</sup> "Epicurus quoque iudicat, cum virtutem habeat, beatum esse."

<sup>37</sup> *Possit*: VPBM; *possis*:  $\zeta$ ; *possit ex possis* corr. *ead. m. Q.*

<sup>38</sup> *Berl. philol. Wechnschr.*, XXXIV (1914), 637; *Suppl. Quirin.*, p. viii.

<sup>39</sup> See R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1895), I, 371 and n. 2; E. Kleckers, "Zu *inquit*, *φησὶ* 'helsst es,'" *Glotta*, XI (1921), 184 f.; E. Albertini, *La Composition dans les ouvrages philosophiques de Sénèque* (Paris: Boccard, 1923), pp. 277, n. 3, 311 f.

<sup>40</sup> See Draeger, I, 100, § 50; Kühner-Stegmann, II, Part I, 5 f.; Stolz-Schmalz, p. 622; Reid on *Cic. Acad.* II, 79.

There are a number of cases of special interest and others where editors have overlooked the usage. In *Ep.* 85. 24 (*bis*) and 26 (*bis*) we have *inquit* after a plural verb of indefinite subject (§ 24: "sic respondere conantur"), while in 87. 22 it follows "respondent Peripatetici" and *inquiunt* (§§ 12, 15), and in 95. 6 and 7 it again follows *inquiunt* (§ 4). Similarly, in *Ben.* iv. 26. 1 *inquit* is immediately followed by *interrogant*. In *Ben.* v. 7. 3 *inquit* refers to *Stoicos* of the preceding section.

We also have alternation with the second person singular: in *Ep.* 118. 15, after *inquis* (§ 13); in 124. 6 and 13, alternating with *tu donas* (§ 7) and *inquis* (§§ 13, 19); *Ben.* iv. 2. 3, after *inquis* (§ 1); v. 19. 3, following *tu* of the previous section; vi. 15. 3, followed shortly by *inquis*; *Clem.* i. 8. 1, followed by *tu* (see below).

In the following instances, too, *inquit* is to be maintained, in my opinion:

*Ep.* 28. 8: Beltrami reads *inquis* with the majority of the manuscripts; cod. p shows *inquit*, which reflects the true reading.

*Ep.* 71. 21: Hense and Beltrami adopt *inquis* of  $\zeta$ ; the older manuscripts read *inquit*.

*Clem.* i. 8. 1: Here *tu* immediately follows; editors read *inquis*, which is found only in cod. T, whereas the other manuscripts show *inquit*.

#### IV. RELATIVE PRONOUNS

##### A. IN A SECOND RELATIVE CLAUSE

In *Ep.* 75. 7—"non est beatus qui scit illa, sed facit"—Hense, with  $\zeta$ , adds *qui* before *facit*, comparing *Ep.* 87. 13, 39, et al. A repetition of the relative would seem natural, but its absolute necessity may be questioned. An exact parallel eludes one, but very close is a case involving an ellipsis of the second verb as well, viz., *Ep.* 94. 8: "cum . . . cognoverit beatam esse vitam non quae secundum voluptatem est, sed secundum naturam."

B. AFTER THE COMPARATIVE *quam*<sup>41</sup>

This construction, occurring at least as early as Cicero, is very frequent in Seneca. Cf., for example, *Ep.* 31. 2, 47. 2, 71. 6, 95. 19, 115. 16; *Dial.* i. 2. 12, v. 30. 2, xi. 14. 4; *Ben.* iii. 29. 1, v. 2. 3, etc. In *Dial.* ix. 6. 2, Wesenberg supplied the relative unnecessarily, as Gertz (*app. crit.*) rightly points out. J. van der Vliet similarly wished to supply the pronoun in *Dial.* xi. 8. 2. In *Ben.* iv. 34. 4, *quam* <*quod*> is commonly read; Gertz is right in abiding by *quam* (without the relative) of cod. N.

## V. BRACHYLOGY WITH DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

A compendious form of expression, not strictly an ellipsis, which we find in Seneca and to which insufficient attention has been paid, is the use of the demonstrative (and the co-ordinating relative) pronoun, not in its usual sense of "this" or "that," but in the sense of "like this," "like that," "of a man like this," etc.

Thus with *hic* we have, for example, *Ep.*

<sup>41</sup> See W. A. Baehrens, "Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax," *Philologus*, Suppl. XII (1911), 375 ff.; Th. Stangl, *Berl. philol. Wchnschr.*, XXXII (1912), 1267; Stolz-Schmalz, pp. 732, 844.

68. 4, 88. 30, 120. 19; *Ben.* vi. 41. 2; *Clem.* i. 19. 5; with *ille*, *Dial.* iii. 16. 6; with *is*, *Ep.* 51. 11 (see immediately below), 92. 20; with the relative pronoun, *Ben.* vii. 19. 7.

The reading of the manuscripts in *Ep.* 51. 11—"Literni honestius Scipio quam Bais exulabat: ruina eius non est tam moliter conlocanda"—was retained by Hense. Beltrami, however, following Io. Mueller,<sup>42</sup> reads *exulabit*. Some editors retain *exulabat* but change *est* to *erat*; others make other changes. It is needless to go into the details of the various emendations.<sup>43</sup> Dissatisfaction with the manuscripts lies in unfamiliarity with the usage described above; *eius* means not "Scipio's" but "of a man like Scipio." Cf. *Ep.* 92. 20: "deinde si sapiens, cui corpus molestum est, nec miser habebitur nec beatus, sed in medio relinquetur, vita quoque eius nec adpetenda erit nec fugienda"; here *vita eius* means "the life such as the philosopher lives."

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

<sup>42</sup> "Kritische Studien zu den Briefen Senecas," *Sitzungsber. Akad. Wiss. Wien.*, CXXXVI (1897), 10.

<sup>43</sup> These are summarized in Beltrami's *apparatus criticus* (2d ed.).



## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### THE FORBIDDEN DIERESIS IN HOMER

In his Homeric grammar, Monro<sup>1</sup> defines dieresis as "the coincidence of the division between words with the division into feet"<sup>2</sup> and states that "there must be no diaeresis after the third foot."<sup>3</sup> This can mean only that Homer does not end the third foot with the final syllable of a word. However, the Homeric introduction to the *Odyssey* has this dieresis in two successive verses (3 f.):

πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἶδεν ἥ ἄστεα καὶ νόον  
ἔγνω·  
πολλὰ δ' ὅ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἥ ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ  
θυμόν.<sup>4</sup>

Homer has a great number of phrases which exactly fill the last three feet of the verse and hence must be preceded by the dieresis at the end of the third foot. Some of these phrases are as follows:

Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα	( <i>Il.</i> v. 53)
ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων	( <i>Il.</i> ii. 766)
Ἀτρείδης Μενέλαος	( <i>Od.</i> iv. 185)
Ἀτρείδης Ἀγαμέμνων	( <i>Il.</i> xiv. 29)
Τηλέμαχος θεοειδής	( <i>Od.</i> i. 113)
Εὐρύμαχος θεοειδής	( <i>Od.</i> iv. 628)
Ναυσίθοος θεοειδής	( <i>Od.</i> vi. 7)
ἀντίθεον Πολύφημον	( <i>Il.</i> i. 264)
Φυλομέδουσα βοῶπις	( <i>Il.</i> vii. 10)
Ἀντίλοχος μενεχάρμης	( <i>Il.</i> xxiii. 419)
ὁ πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς	( <i>Il.</i> ii. 278)
Νέστορος ἀγλαῶς υἱός	( <i>Od.</i> iv. 21)
Ἀμφιτρύωνος ἄκοιτιν	( <i>Od.</i> xi. 266)
πῶς ἀγαθὸν Πολυδεῖκεα	( <i>Od.</i> xi. 300)
Δαρδανίδες βαθύκολποι	( <i>Il.</i> xviii. 339)
Τρῳάδας ἐλκεσιπέπλους	( <i>Il.</i> xxii. 105)
Ἀρκάδες ἐγχεσίμωροι	( <i>Il.</i> vii. 134)
Αἰτωλοὶ μενεχάρμαι	( <i>Il.</i> ix. 529)
ἀνέρες ἀγχιμαχηταί	( <i>Il.</i> ii. 604)

ἄσπιδες ὀμφαλόδεσσαι	( <i>Il.</i> iv. 448)
ἀντολαὶ Ἑλίοιο	( <i>Od.</i> xii. 4)
εὐρύαγκια Μυκῆνη	( <i>Il.</i> iv. 52)
Ἑλλησποντος ἀπείρων	( <i>Il.</i> xxiv. 545)
ὀλέσσει Ζάκυνθος	( <i>Od.</i> ix. 24)
Ἴλιον ἡμερόδεσαν	( <i>Il.</i> iii. 305)
Μηρονίης ἐρατεινῆς	( <i>Il.</i> iii. 401)
γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ	( <i>Od.</i> iv. 703)
κύματα μακρὰ θαλάσσης	( <i>Il.</i> ii. 144)

Even more notable than these phrases is the number of short sentences which occupy the last three feet of the verse. Some of these are the following:

οὐκ ἶδον ὄμματα φωτός	( <i>Il.</i> xi. 614)
ἄγγελος εἴμ' Ἀχιλλῆι	( <i>Il.</i> xi. 652)
ἔπατο δεξιὸς ὄρνις	( <i>Od.</i> xv. 531)
Μέντορι πάντα ἐφέκιν	( <i>Od.</i> xxiv. 446)
ἦλθε διὸς Ὀδυσσεύς	( <i>Il.</i> iii. 205)
ἀθροὶ ἦλθον ἅπαντες	( <i>Od.</i> iii. 34)
οὐκέτι πιστὰ γυναιξίν	( <i>Od.</i> xi. 456)
ἦλασε πῖονα μῆλα	( <i>Od.</i> ix. 237)
μῆδετο μῆτιετα Ζεὺς	( <i>Il.</i> vii. 478)
εὐχετόωντο θεοῖσιν	( <i>Od.</i> xii. 356)
οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἴκανε	( <i>Od.</i> viii. 74)
εὗξατο δὲ κατὰ θυμόν	( <i>Od.</i> v. 444)
ἰστία μηρύσαντο	( <i>Od.</i> xii. 170)
ὑπνον δῶρον ἔλοντο	( <i>Il.</i> vii. 482)
οὔτιδανόισιν ἀνέσσεις	( <i>Il.</i> i. 231)
σύνθεο καὶ μεν ἄκουσον	( <i>Od.</i> xxiv. 265)
ἤλθομεν ὦκα κύντες	( <i>Od.</i> xv. 472)
ἔξετο νόσφι λιασθείς	( <i>Il.</i> i. 349)

Since the third foot in Homer regularly has a caesura, which often marks a sense pause as well as the end of a word, the poet would have a real difficulty in using any of these phrases which completely fill the last three feet of the verse, as there would be a vacancy between the caesura and the beginning of the fourth foot. Homer had many words which just filled up that gap, such words as δέ, ἐπεὶ, ἀτάρ, ἦ, τε καί, but especially καί, as it is short before a

<sup>1</sup> D. B. Monro, *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect* (2d ed.: Oxford, 1891).

<sup>2</sup> P. 338.

<sup>3</sup> P. 339.

<sup>4</sup> All quotations are based on the Teubner text, fifth ed.



under Macrinus. The reason for this remarkable occurrence can only have been military. If fiscal considerations or the wish to flatter the pride of the minting towns would have brought Caracalla to a policy of decentralized minting, as has recently been suggested in a most useful monograph,<sup>1</sup> the emperor would not have restricted his measures to the hinterland of the future theater of war. In my opinion, we have here an experiment of the imperial general staff to decentralize not only the payment of the Roman forces but also the considerable expenses which the permanent use of civilian merchant ships and native caravans for supplies necessarily involves for each middle eastern campaign.

It is, therefore, not surprising that the whole Syro-Palestinian seaboard from Seleucia Pieria to Gaza appears on the map with certain or probable mints at Aradus, Ascalon, Berytus, Byblus, Caesarea in Palestine, Gabala, Gaza, Laodicea ad Mare, Orthosia, Seleucia Pieria, Tripolis, and Tyre. In addition, Cilician Tarsus issued its municipal billon of a similar type for the last time under Caracalla and Macrinus.<sup>2</sup> A network of mints inland from these ports indicates the main routes used for the supply organization of Caracalla's armies. In the south the bases of Neapolis and Aelia Capitolina lead to Gadara, with its well-known caravan route to the Euphrates. In the center the caravan towns of Damascus, Emisa, and Heliopolis appear to be involved. In northern Syria, which was nearest to the front, the network of supply bases seems to be even closer and includes Antioch, Beroea, Cyrrhus, Zeugma, and Hierapolis. In Mesopotamia billon tetra-

drachms seem to have been minted at Edessa, Carrhae, and Rhessaena; and it would not be surprising if future finds indicated Anthemusias, Nisibis, or Singara as additional mints and main depots of the campaigns. Salamis in Cyprus, too, seems to have been a supply base for Caracalla's army, if Seyrig and Bellinger are right in their attribution of one series of coins.<sup>3</sup> Cyprus may have played a similar role for the supply of the Roman armies in Syria, as for those of the Allies in the present war.

It should be noted that the number of additional mints seems already to be decreasing in the period of the return of the legions to their peace stations under Macrinus. Tetradrachms of this emperor are not at present known from the Cyprian Salamis (?), Ascalon, Damascus, Neapolis, Orthosia, Sidon, Tripolis, and Zeugma. The discovery of new coins may shorten this list; but it is at least remarkable that most of the towns which seem to have ceased minting after Caracalla's death are far back in the center and south of the theater of war. They had been valuable as bases for the growing supply needs of a mobilization but could well be spared during a demobilization, with its decreasing requirements. The needs of the eastern civil population seem to have required only the continuation of the issues of billon tetradrachms in Antioch and Tyre, and probably in Edessa for a short period after Macrinus. It may be of service to compare, after the end of the present war, the supply bases chosen for the campaigns in Syria, Irak, and Iran during recent years with those indicated by the minting towns of Caracalla and Macrinus. In spite of differences in tactical planning, a close similarity already appears, before any official staff publication has become available; and this is not surprising. Many of the Syrian caravan routes of antiquity appear practically unchanged even to this day.

The reason why Caracalla preferred to mint provincial tetradrachms during his mobilization against Parthia instead of completely relying on the output of imperial denarii was that the Syrian tetradrachms of his time were more liked and had a higher value than the bad denarii issued since the period of Com-

<sup>1</sup> Alfred R. Bellinger, "The Syrian Tetradrachms of Caracalla and Macrinus," *Numismatic Studies*, III (1940), 6 f., 14 f. Professor Bellinger has collected as much of the available evidence as was possible during the years preceding the present world crisis. His attributions of issues to certain mints are in many cases final and always stimulating, although corrections may be forthcoming when additional evidence can be surveyed at leisure in a more peaceful world, especially that from smaller museums, from private collections, from the more reliable sales catalogues, and from drawings in early numismatic publications which the author had to exclude with a few instructive exceptions.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Brit. Mus. Cat. Lycaonia*, pp. 179 f.; B. Head, *Hist. Num.*<sup>3</sup> (1911), p. 734.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Bellinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 104 f.

modus. In normal times a Syrian tetradrachm equaled 3 denarii; but in our period, as we are informed in the Talmud,<sup>4</sup> they had gone up to 3½ and even 4. We may infer that a devaluation of Syrian tetradrachms followed Caracalla's enormous output. It is certainly not by chance that certain Syrian tetradrachms of Caracalla, now published for the first time by Professor Bellinger as Nos. 263-66 and probably minted in Byblus, show on the reverse the signs XX or K<sub>1</sub>, obviously Latin and Greek marks of value. These remarkable signs cannot, in my opinion, be separated from the identical marks of value on the so-called Antoniniani of Aurelian and Diocletian, which have been discussed by many scholars. In our case

<sup>4</sup> F. M. Heichelheim, in T. Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, III (1938), 219 f.

these signs probably mean that a billon tetradrachm was considered the equivalent of the Antoninianus, which had been created by Caracalla a short time earlier. The new evidence supports the opinion of numerous scholars that this original Antoninianus had the value of two denarii<sup>5</sup> and not less.

F. M. HEICHELHEIM

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE  
NOTTINGHAM, ENGLAND

<sup>5</sup> For this difficult problem cf. H. Mattingly and E. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, IV (1936), vi and 85; H. Mattingly, E. Sydenham, and P. Webb, *op. cit.*, V, Part I (1927), 9 f.; K. Regling, in von Schrötter, *Wörterbuch der Münzkunde* (1930), s.v. "Argenteus"; H. Mattingly, *Roman Coins* (1928), pp. 129 f.; E. Stein, *Geschichte des spätromischen Reiches*, I (1928), 60, n. 1; W. Kubitschek, in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, I, 2568 f., s.v. "Antoninianus"; Otto Seeck, *ibid.*, V, 211 f., s.v., "Denarius."

### CARINA

The dictionaries invariably give two basic meanings for this word, "keel" (or "hull") and "nutshell," and the etymological dictionaries discuss which of the two is the older. For the second the *Thesaurus* quotes three passages. An examination of these shows that, in reality, the word did not have this sense.

Before examining them it is worth noting that Latin at all periods had an established term for "nutshell," that is (*nucis*) *putamen*; cf. Plaut. *Capt.* 655: "nuculeum amisi, reliqui pigneri putamina"; Cic. *Tusc.* v. 58: "iuglandium putaminibus"; Varro *Rust.* i. 7. 3: "(nucum) putamina"; and Pliny *NH.* xv. 88, discussed below. As languages do not normally have two terms for one such simple idea, *carina* must either be an occasional variant, for some special stylistic or other reason, on *putamen* or else differ from it in sense. That the latter is the case is shown by Pliny's *putaminum carinae*.

Of the three passages in the *Thesaurus*, it will be convenient to consider, first, Pallad. ii. 15 (in planting *walnuts*): "ponemus autem transversas, ut latus id est carina ipsa figatur in terra. cacumen ipsum, cum ponimus nucem, in aquilonis partem dirigemus." This makes no sort of sense if *carina* is the whole shell. What it actually is, is shown by a com-

parison with Pliny xvii. 64: "iuglandes nuces porrectae seruntur commissuris iacentibus." Palladius' *carina* is Pliny's *commissura*, i.e., the ridge or seam of the walnut where the two halves join. The nut is to be planted in a horizontal position (Palladius' *transversas*, Pliny's *porrectae*), with the seam in the vertical plane.<sup>1</sup> This position was apparently suggested by nature, as a walnut, if let fall, rests normally with this seam touching the ground.

The interpretation is in agreement with Pliny xv. 88. Here again it is the *walnut* that

<sup>1</sup> It may be of use to add a few details about the passage in Palladius:

1. Before talking about walnuts, he has been discussing the planting of almonds and says: "fodiemus ergo altam pede uno semis aream, in qua obruemus amygdala, non amplius quattuor digitis, ita ut acumina figamus in terra." Then after full instructions about almonds he says of the walnut "serenda est nucibus suis eo more, quo et amygdala seruntur . . . ponemus autem transversas," etc. In general, then, the method of planting is the same, but walnuts are to be set horizontally, whereas almonds are to be set vertically, the sharp points deepest in the ground.

2. Palladius' *ipsa* and *ipsum* are merely instances of the weak use of the word, now on its way to become a definite article: see Einar Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aethiopiae*, p. 64.

3. Why the *cacumen* of the walnut, which I take to be the sharp end, much like the *acumen* of the almond, should point north I do not profess to know, but it does not affect the question of the meaning of *carina*.

is being described. After calling the whole hard shell *ligneum putamen* in line 86, he says "sunt bifidae putaminum carinae," where the *carina* cannot be the whole shell, and the ridge is the only part that is *bifidus*.

In the third passage, Serenus Sammonicus 444 (in the section "praecordiis sanandis"), "quod superest, styraei iunges ramenta carinae," there is nothing in the context to show whether *carina nuci* or *carina navis* is meant. Now *carina* by itself could make a reader think only of ships, this being the common use of the word, and this gives a perfectly good sense. What Serenus meant is shown by Pliny xvi. 56: "non omittendum apud eosdem zopissam vocari derasam navibus maritimis picem cum cera, nihil non experiente vita, multoque efficacior ad omnia quibus pices resinaeque prosunt, videlicet adiecto salis callo" (medical uses of pitch, §§ 54-55).

Let us now turn to the *carinae* of ships. The traditional sense given to the word is "keel," but sometimes—e.g., in Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, s.v. "Kiel"; Nettle's *Contributions to Latin Lexicography*, s.h.v.; Müller-Graupa, *Philologus*, LXXIII, 309<sup>2</sup>—it has been maintained that it means "hull." The truth seems to be that it has both senses. That of "keel" is established by such passages as Plaut. *Mil.* 916 ff.: "bene lineatam si semel carinam conlocavit," of the first step in building a ship; Ov. *Met.* xiv. 552: "mediisque carina subdita navigiis spinae mutatur in usum" (only the keel could be turned into a nymph's backbone); Caes. *BC* i. 54. 2: "carinae ac prima statumina ex levi materia fiebant"; Catull. 64. 10: "pineae coniungens inflexae texta carinae" (*inflexus* is always a participle, never an adjective, and Catullus is describing briefly the essential operations of first bending the keel into shape—a process especially important as the keel-beam ran up into the prow and the stern—and then adding the sides); Liv. xxii. 20. 2: "carinas fixerant vadis." In the frequent *panda carina*, *curva carina* the meaning is hardly less certain. I take the adjectives to describe the shape of the keel lengthwise. A glance at any collection of il-

lustrations of ancient ships that have come down to us will make it abundantly clear that this is the curved line that the ancients thought of when they visualized ships. On the other hand, there are passages in which the other meaning does seem preferable, such as the passage from which Müller-Graupa's discussion starts, Sall. *Iug.* 18: "ceterum adhuc aedificia Numidarum agrestium, quae mapalia illi vocant, oblonga incurvis lateribus tecta quasi navium carinae sunt."<sup>3</sup> How, then, could the same word mean both these things? I take it that "keel" is the strict technical sense of the word, "hull" a vaguer sense in which it was used in less technical contexts.<sup>4</sup> This vaguer sense is in keeping with the lack of precision otherwise observable in such passages as that quoted here from Sallust, the difficulties of which are brought out by Müller-Graupa.<sup>5</sup> There is the further consideration that, if *carina* does not mean "keel," Latin had no word for this all-important part of a ship, whereas for "hull" there is also *alveus*.

The two parts of my discussion may now be brought together. If what I have said is true, the *carina* of a walnut is its "keel."

If this result is accepted, the etymology of the word must be sought in connection primarily with ships. The suggested derivation from *κάρπυον* would be easy if the wood of any nut tree had been used for keels. *Carina* would then be an adjective, with *trabs* or the like understood. But there is no evidence for such a use of these woods. The derivation from \**qar*, "hard," remains possible, as the keel might be named from the hardness of the wood chosen. There is, however, another possibility, that it is named from its shape and

<sup>2</sup> Besides, of course, passages which have the common poetical synecdoche *carina* = *navis*.

<sup>3</sup> It was this vaguer sense which passed into the Romance languages, It. *carena*, whence Fr. *carène*, a Germanic word being imported for the keel proper, in Fr. *quille*, It. *chiglia*.

<sup>4</sup> There is a possibility that seems to have been overlooked, that is that we should put a full stop after *lateribus* and make the *tecta* alone *quasi navium carinae*. This is strongly supported by Müller-Graupa's quotation from Sulpicius Severus (*Dial.* 1. 3. 3): "tribus fere a litore milibus tugarum inter harenas conspicio, cuius tectum, sicut Sallustius ait, quasi carina navis erat . . . satis firmis tabulatis constratum."

<sup>5</sup> Both Nettle and Müller-Graupa speak as if the idea were quite new.



belongs to *\*(s)ger-*, "drehen, biegen" (Walde-Hofmann, s.v. "curvus"), thus being cognate with the *curvus* so often applied to it and with the *κορυνίσι* of Homer's *νηυσὶ κορυνίσι*; for the vowel of the main syllable cf. especially *cardo* from *\*(s)ger-*, "springen." For the semantic side of this suggested etymology compare the

remark of Falk and Torp<sup>4</sup> that the basic meaning of the Germanic equivalent is "ein am einen ende gekrümmter gegenstand."

G. P. SHIPP

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

<sup>4</sup> H. S. Falk and A. Torp, *Norwegisch-dänisches etym. Wörterbuch*, s.v. "Kjød."

### AB OVO USQUE AD MALA

In *Ad fam.* ix. 20. 1 Cicero, writing to Paetus, regrets that he cannot visit him and continues: "habuisses enim non hospitem, sed contubernalem. at quem virum! non eum quem tu es solitus promulside conficere; integram famem ad ovum adfero, itaque usque ad assum vitulinum opera perducitur." The only natural interpretation of this passage is that for Cicero the *ovum* is not a part of the *promulsis* but comes after it, presumably immediately after it. This is borne out by the closely parallel passage in ix. 16. 8, addressed to the same Paetus: "neque est quod in promulside spei ponas aliquid; quam totam sustuli; solebam enim antea debilitari oleis et luanicis tuis."

What, then, of Horace's famous *ab ovo usque ad mala*, from which it has always been inferred that eggs were the very first things eaten?

The traditional view is supported by Varro *Men.* 102: "discumbimus mussati. dominus maturo ovo cenam committit."<sup>1</sup> In Martial

<sup>1</sup> So Bücheler-Heraeus. The passage is pieced together from three quotations in Nonius, of which only one, 553 L. (349 M.), actually gives *ovo*, the lemma being "maturum: mite, coctum." Lindsay reads *mur-*

xi. 52 eggs are included, both by themselves and as a garnish, only in the *gustus*, which cannot be distinguished from the *promulsis*. They are not, however, the first item of all, for Martial writes in lines 5-6, "prima tibi dabitur ventri lactuca movendo utilis," including eggs in a second relay introduced by *mox*, line 7. The only solution I can offer is that there was a custom of beginning with eggs, sometimes departed from in elaborate dinners.<sup>2</sup>

G. P. SHIPP

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

*rati* for *mussati*, otherwise as above. The passage is too insecure a foundation for much to be built upon it.

<sup>2</sup> Cicero's *contubernalem* is explained by what follows, "In Epicuri nos, adversarii nostri, castra colectimus," Paetus already being in Epicurus' camp, the military terminology being carried on from *scurram velitem* above. Similarly, in ix. 25. 2, "tuis combibonibus Epicurilis," it is perhaps not fanciful to suppose that the noun is chosen as reminiscent in form and is probably built on the analogy of *commilito*, just as in Lucilius 665 M., "magnis combibonum ex coplis," the last word suggests the army.

There is a curious parallel in the Varro quoted, where "cenam committit" is in all probability intended to recall "pugnam committere," with the same metaphor as in Plaut. *Pers.* 112: "sed quid cessamus proelium committere?" and Juv. v. 169: "stricto pane."

### A LATIN IDIOM AND PLINY *Ep.* iv. 2. 2

The idiom by which a compound verb is repeated by means of the corresponding simple verb has occasionally been pointed out for Greek, as by Neil in his note on Arist. *Eq.* 98, where *ἐνεργ'* repeats the *ἐξένεργε* of line 95,<sup>1</sup> but not, as far as I remember, for Latin. That it was known there is shown by the following passages: Pacuv. 410 R.: "intuentur<sup>2</sup> nec tuendi capere satietas potest"; Cic. *Ad fam.*

ii. 17. 4: "terruncium nec attigit nec tacturus est quisquam"; Liv. xxii. 22. 11: "metum continuasse ad eam diem Hispanorum animos . . . quos metus non teneat."

The observation is important for the interpretation of Pliny *Ep.* iv. 2. 2: "hunc Regulus emancipavit, ut heres matris existeret; mancipatum (ita vulgo ex moribus hominis loquebantur) foeda et insolita parentibus indulgentiae simulatione captabat." Here a difference between *emancipo* and *mancipo* has been sought; and Merrill, for example, has a

<sup>1</sup> To Neil's examples add Herod. i. 192: *οἱ ἴπποι ἀναβαίνοντες τὰς θηλάς . . . αἱ δὲ βαυόμεναι*.

<sup>2</sup> Or some other part of the same verb: see Ribbeck's note.

note on *mancipatum*: "with a play on the meaning of the word, which is occasionally used technically of deeding over to another (like *emancipare*) but also meant 'to capture' (*manu capere*) instead of 'to release.' " This is most unsatisfactory. The only evidence for this second sense of *mancipo* given by Lewis and Short is a passage from Solinus; and it is hard to believe that in normal usage the one word could have such opposite meanings, nor does it seem possible that Pliny should be so

little conscious of the literal sense of *capto* as to write *mancipatum* . . . *captabat* with *mancipatum* in the sense suggested, giving the result "having captured him . . . he proceeded to hunt him." On the other hand, there is no difficulty in equating *emancipo* and *mancipo* here. The parenthesis will then mean simply that the interpretation commonly placed on Regulus' indulgence was that he was playing the part of *captator* to his own son.

G. P. SHIPP

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

### "BUCCA, BUCCA" IN SOUTH AFRICA

The interesting articles on "*Bucca, Bucca*" by B. L. Ullman and P. Brewster in *Classical Philology*, Volume XXXVIII, Number 2, reminded me that some years ago I put forward, but did not publish, the suggestion that our Afrikaans game "Bok, Bok" might be related to the game described by Petronius. All doubts are now removed, particularly if we accept, as I think we can, Professor Ullman's brilliant investigation into the history of the word *bucca*.

In South Africa the game is played by teams. The team that is "out" bend down in a row, each player placing his head between the legs of the player in front. The members of the opposing team then jump on the backs waiting to receive them, and when all have taken their places on their often unsteady opponents, the leader, holding up a certain number of fingers, cries

Bok, bok, staan styf,  
Hoeveel vingers op jou lyf?  
[Buck, buck, stand firm,  
How many fingers on your body?]

It is clear that "fingers" alternate with "horns" in many places, as Brewster has shown. In England children used to say: "Buck, buck, how many fingers have I got up?" But there, as mostly in Europe, the game seems to have been a form of *micare digitis* or flash-finger, not played by teams but by individuals.

The game is evidently of preclassical origin. Can it be shown to be Indo-Germanic? For South Africans, with their large Mohammedan population at the Cape, it is interesting to find that in two respects the Turkish game resembles the game as it is played in South Africa (particularly at the Cape): (1) The term "fingers" is used in the formal questions, and (2) the game is played by teams, the "flash-finger" type being practically unknown.<sup>1</sup>

T. J. HAARHOFF

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND

<sup>1</sup> [This note was accepted before the publication of the longer account by P. G. Brewster, "Some African Variants of 'Bucca, Bucca,'" in the *Classical Journal* for February, 1944.—Editor.]

### THE "FAITHFUL SAYING" AGAIN

In Volume XXXVIII, pages 202 ff., of this *Journal*, Professors W. A. Oldfather and L. W. Daly, if I do not grossly misunderstand them, conjecture (a) that I Tim. 1:15 and 4:9, II Tim. 2:11, and Titus 3:8 conceal a quotation from a classical author; (b) that that author was Menander; and (c) that the original form, a trimeter, can be restored by writing

πιστὸς ὁ λόγος ἀποδοχῆς πάσης ἀξίος.

With (a) and (b) I have no quarrel, for they are perfectly legitimate suppositions, if unproved. But I cannot accept (c) unless and until someone can produce an undoubted trimeter of Menander's date, style, and language with a spondee in its fourth foot.

H. J. ROSE

ST. ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*, Vol. III. Edited with notes by ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON and SIDNEY PULLMAN GOODRICH. ("Princeton University Studies in Papyrology," edited by ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON, No. 4.) Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. xii + 124.

With this volume the publication of the Princeton collection of papyri comes to an end. The genesis and history of the collection were recently the subject of a brief sketch by Professor Johnson.<sup>1</sup> The first volume of papyri was issued in 1931, and since that time there has been no pause in the exploitation of the valuable materials intrusted to the university by Mr. Robert Garrett and Mr. John H. Scheide. Under Johnson's leadership the papyrus texts have been made available to scholars everywhere, and useful dissertations have been produced by members of Johnson's seminar. In the latest volume of papyri Johnson has again generously associated with himself two of his students. S. P. Goodrich is a full collaborator, and Bruce Metzger is responsible for a fragment of Isocrates (No. 113) and a magical text (No. 159).

This volume resembles the final volumes of other series in presenting an unusually large number of mutilated papyri. Many are gravely damaged and may on that account never become the object of active scholarly interest. Recognizing this limitation the editors have separated twenty-one pieces (Nos. 171-91) as not deserving extended comment. Of the remainder, more than a few are sufficiently injured to discourage the amateur. In this matter the fault does not lie with the editors. In general, every editor who stays with his job long enough to see the bottom of the barrel looks upon a disheartening prospect. If he is

imbued with the requisite sense of duty, he persists to the end; he knows that he must take his collection as it comes.<sup>2</sup>

Many have asked what value attaches to the numerous fragmentary papyri, ostraca, and inscriptions which remain inert because they cannot be interpreted. Many have accused editors of painstaking futility, not remembering that every knickknack enveloped in light helps to abolish another dark corner. A scholar's mission is to bring light into the darkness, but he knows how to wait patiently for knowledge to come in its own time. A solemn obligation rests on the editor not to neglect those texts which he does not understand; he assumes that others will succeed where he has failed. Renan, who saw deeply into the nature of scientific work, pictured the dilemma of the philologist in a memorable figure:

Est-il nécessaire que l'ouvrier qui extrait les blocs de la carrière ait l'idée du monument futur dans lequel ils entreront? Parmi les laborieux travailleurs qui ont construit l'édifice de la science, plusieurs n'ont vu que la pierre qu'ils taillaient, ou tout au plus la région limitée où ils la plaçaient. Semblables à des fourmis, ils apportent chacun leur tribut individuel, renversent quelque obstacle, se croissent sans cesse, en apparence dans un désordre complet et ne faisant que se gêner les uns les autres. Et pourtant il arrive que, par les travaux réunis de tant d'hommes, sans qu'aucun plan ait été combiné à l'avance, une science se trouve organisée dans ses belles proportions. Un génie invisible a été l'architecte qui présidait à l'ensemble, et faisait concourir ces efforts isolés à une parfaite unité."<sup>3</sup>

With this assurance of utility, the editor applies the same rigorous method to the tattered,

<sup>2</sup> For further comment on this theme see my remarks on *P. Tebt.*, III, II (*AJP*, LXIII [1942], 244) and *P. Col. Zen.*, II (*ibid.*, LXIV [1943], 212). Even so patient and thorough an editor as C. C. Edgar, whose unusual gift made him the peer of Grenfell and Hunt, found the materials in the last Tebtunis volume "exceedingly dry."

<sup>3</sup> Ernest Renan, *L'Avenir de la science* (Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1890), p. 120.

<sup>1</sup> *The Princeton University Library Chronicle*, Vol. III, No. 4 (June, 1942); *The Garrett Collection of Manuscripts*, chap. v, "The Papyri," pp. 140-44.

pointless fragment as to the complete, meaningful document.<sup>4</sup>

The last volume of the Princeton papyrus series begins with a few literary pieces (Nos. 108–15), which include fragments of the *Iliad*, Xenophon's *Hellenica*, and Isocrates' *Antidosis*. Their failure to yield any notable variant from the standard texts is itself instructive. In the introduction to two mutilated columns of medical content the editors have supplied a useful list of medical papyri published since 1931. For matters of greater interest, however, we must turn to the nonliterary documents. These are widely distributed both in space and in time, and several are significant.

No. 119 relates the machinations of a fourth-century informer.<sup>5</sup> No. 124 emphasizes the advantageous position of a metropolitan, i.e., a resident of a nome capital, as opposed to a villager. No. 127 is a letter from the registration officers (*laographoi*) of Theadelphia to persons appointed to convey records to the auditor of the nome at Alexandria; they state that they have delivered to these officials a census list for the twenty-third year of Antoninus Pius.<sup>6</sup> Of great value is No. 128, which throws unexpected light on the agrarian institution known as *πιττάκιον*. This text "may

imply that the sublease was by no means voluntary." The editors make an illuminating comparison of No. 131 with *P. Iand.*, VII, 137. The tax for the catoecic registry paid by Perigenia corresponds pretty well to the rate laid down for women in the gnomon. Interesting is the postponement of the tax payment for almost a year beyond the date of the cession. The transfer of ownership in the official registers was doubtless not completed until the appropriate fees had been paid, and this practice accounts for the delay frequently observed in the registration of newly acquired property. See, e.g., *BGU*, VII, 1565, where slightly more than a year intervenes between acquisition of the property and its registration. Nos. 141 and 142 are worth the grammarian's attention; they show strong Egyptian influence in the treatment of stops. No. 146, a sublease of public land executed at Tebtunis in A.D. 36, is connected with *P. Mich.*, II, 121<sup>r</sup>, II, vi, through Marsisouchos, the lessee.

The increasing stringency of the measures to which government was forced to resort from the late second century A.D. is illustrated in No. 148, an application for the lease of public land. The applicant is willing to undertake a lease for five years, but he stipulates that at the conclusion of that period he must not be held to the terms of the lease against his will. Something of a novelty is No. 151, a fourth-century lease for one year of two female slaves who shall be "immortal." If either slave should not survive the lease, she must be replaced by the lessee with one of equal value. If the slaves bear children, these belong to the lessee. No. 159 is an amulet intended to procure relief from fever for a sick man or boy who is ailing; the introduction and commentaries are rich in bibliography.

No. 165 is a letter of the second century A.D. in which the addressee is requested to send a good fish for the celebration of a birthday, probably that of the emperor.<sup>7</sup> The only

<sup>4</sup> The contact of a brilliant mind with a badly broken text will sometimes produce remarkable results. An example in recent literature is Premerstein's monograph on *Alexandrinische Geronten vor Kaiser Gaius* ("Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek," Vol. V [1936]). As Collart (*Mélanges Glotz*, I, 241) justly remarks, "Les papyrologues, rebutés souvent par 'la froide platitude' d'un texte pénible à déchiffrer et à comprendre, peuvent reprendre courage: ils méconnaissent peut-être la valeur de leur papyrus."

<sup>5</sup> The petition makes much of the claim that "the laws abominate those who meddle with the property of others and undertake to bring indictments." The editors dismiss this sentiment as a pious platitude, but it is also an attempt to invoke a legal maxim. A gathering of such expressions from the papyri—they are sufficiently abundant to repay the effort—would make an interesting contribution to the history of socio-legal thought. What is involved here is not so much the rational effort of government to afford adequate legal protection as the popular demand that government take its stand on the side of justice.

<sup>6</sup> In ll. 11 f. the published text has *ἡ συνθεσις κτλ.*, which the editors render: "The supplement follows the rolls handed in by us." I prefer *ἡ συνθεσις κτλ.*, dependent from *κατ' ἀδρα ἀπογο(αφῆν)* in ll. 8 f.: "a census list . . . which, as compiled, follows the [declaratory] sheets submitted to us."

<sup>7</sup> Editors' translation: "For you know that it is my official birthday," which is a *contresens*. Such language is not fitting for a private person. The critical words are *κυρία ἐστὶ ἡ γενέσις*, I. e., *κυρία ἐστὶ ἡ γενέσις(ος) αὐτῆς*. Cf. *ἡ κυρία ἡμέρα* in classical authors or in F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch d. griech. Papyrussurk.*, s.v. *κύριος*, adj., 3. The imperial birthdays played a large part in the Egyptian calendar (W. F. Snyder, *Ἡμεραι Σεβασταί, Aegyptus*, XVIII [1938], 197–233; cf. *P. Oxy.*, III, 521, Introduct.).

comparable documents, so far as I know, are of the Ptolemaic period.<sup>8</sup> Nos. 166 and 167 exemplify the persistence in Egypt to a late date of native religious ideas and customs. In 166 a goldsmith, having learned that his father has died while away from home, admonishes a friend to procure his body and to keep it safe against his own arrival. The desire to keep the body intact is characteristically Egyptian. Body and soul were so closely linked in older Egyptian thought that the destruction of the one involved serious consequences for the other. The danger to which an unburied corpse was exposed is vividly illustrated in *UPZ*, II, 187, a complaint from a *choachytes* that wolves or jackals entered a tomb in his possession, which had been left open by an intruder intent on plunder, and mutilated a number of mummies intrusted to his care. In No. 167 (third cent.) a common formula, "I make obeisance for you before our ancestral gods," is followed by the words "as you instructed me." Such a phrase reminds us that pagan religious feeling was real and vigorous right up to the day that Constantine had his vision of an empire united under the Christian banner. Similarly, in *P. Mich.*, III, 213 (third cent.), an unexpected greeting to the Tyche of the household, coming at the end of a list of salutations to relatives and friends, reveals the easy intercourse that was still possible in the third century between the individual and his gods.<sup>9</sup> No. 188 looks rather lost among the "Descriptions." It is another letter, like *P. Oxy.*, IV, 744, in which the exposure of an infant is treated most casually. Egypt had been free of this inhuman practice before it was imported by the Greeks, and only the Christian community, by absorbing so much of Hellenism as it found compatible or necessary and outlawing the rest, rid Egypt of a demoralizing plague.

This survey of *P. Princeton*, III, is of course inadequate, as surveys of editions always are, and a few critical remarks may help to round it out. My suggestions were submitted to Professor Johnson, who had the great kindness

<sup>8</sup> *Esp. P. Col. Zen.*, II, 70; see editors' Intro.

<sup>9</sup> The systematic study of papyrus materials useful for gauging the reality and intensity of personal religious sentiment would add considerable vitality to the history of the later paganism.

to check them against the papyri when that course was indicated. I reproduce here only those which have gained his approval or have been modified under the impact of his criticism.<sup>10</sup>

116. The imperative in line 11 does not suggest a petition of the kind to be classed among "Official Documents" but rather a simple communication, a memorandum (see Paul Collomp, *Recherches sur la chancellerie et la diplomatie des Lagides* ["*Pub. Univ. Strasbourg*," Vol. XXIX (1926)], p. 151). For memoranda which conclude with *εὐτύχει* see *P. Mich.*, I, 89 and 97; these are petitions of a private character.

8. *ὁπόταν* can be read: "Whenever an opportunity permits him."

117. 5-10. Something more can be done toward the understanding of these lines. The following restoration gives a suitable sense.

προφερο-  
[μ]ένη [Τεσενούφιν] παραθεμέ-  
[ν]ην με α[ὐ]τῶι ἐν τ[ῶ]ι θ[ε]σαυρῶι (πυροῦ ἀρτ.)  
σφγ  
[ἀρνή]σασθ[αί] μ[ου] αἰτούσης αὐ[τῶ]ς ἐμέ  
κτλ.

Translate: "Alleging that when I asked for them Tesenouphis denied that I had deposited with him in the granary 293 art. of wheat and had made an agreement with him whereby he would return them in the 27th year." With the repetition of pronouns cf. *P. Mich.*, III, 214. 13 f.; 216. 4; Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik d. griech. Papyri aus d. Ptolemäerzeit*, II, Part I, 63 f. On the late use of the gen. abs. see *ibid.*, II, Part III, 68c-d.

11-12. The meaning of *ὑπεσχόμεν* is obscured (see editors' note) by the scribe's elimination of *καί* (l. 10). The phrase *βουλομένη κτλ.* is properly co-ordinate with *προφερομένη κτλ.* (l. 5): "I submitted a petition . . . alleging . . . and desiring

<sup>10</sup> I do not touch on translation or the interpretation of detail, unless these affect the general bearing of the text. Occasional errors have crept into the translations, but these can safely be left to the discretion of the Greek scholar.



to arrest him." With *ὑπεσχόμεν* a new sentence begins: "I had agreed [to the terms of the deposit] and he had written a [confirmatory] letter, etc." The asyndetic juxtaposition of sentences is continued with *ἔγραψας* in line 15. For the meaning of *ὑπεσχόμεν* see F. Preisigke, *op. cit.*, s.v. *ὑπισχνέομαι*, 2; Liddell and Scott (new ed.), s.v., 3.

18–19. Since *ἐντυχοῦσ[α]* is a blunder for a gen. abs., the period at the end of line 19 should be replaced with a comma.

21–22. The order of words in *ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων εἰ β[ούλη] ὄν[τα]* is bothersome, but the obvious remedies cannot be reconciled with the papyrus.<sup>11</sup>

119. 17. *ἀναμε[ρισμέν]ης* necessitates a correction of the text (see editors' note). The difficulty is eliminated by substituting *ἀναμε[τρομέν]ης* on the analogy of lines 45–46. In both places *τῆς νέας ἀμπέλου* designates a general category of land, not simply the vineyard which is the occasion of the dispute.

20. *προσγραφήναι τοῖς βοηθ[οῖς] ἀμέλι* is unintelligible. A satisfactory sense is obtained with *καὶ* *προσγραφήναι τοῖς βοηθ[οῖς]*. *ἀμέλ[ε]ι καὶ κτλ.*: "and was registered by the assistants. Actually, etc." For *ἀμέλει καὶ* see Crönert's revision of Passow, *Wörterbuch d. griech. Sprache*, s.v. *ἀμελέω*, col. 360. His most convenient reference is Luc. *Nigr.* 26.

124. 18. Eliminate *δέ*, since evidently *τὰ ὀνόματα* governs the genitive construction which begins in line 7.

128. 7. The space suffices for *ἄρτι*.

129. 16. Change *[ὑπάρ]χ(οντα)* to *[ὑπάρ]χ(ουσι)*. The same construction in the same place is used in *P. Mich.*, III, 176. 17, and there are other examples.

131. 10. Change *προκα[τέ]χω(ντος)* to *παρακαχω(ρηκός)*. Johnson writes that the latter is "quite possible," but "the hand is

very illegible." The proof of the suggestion must be sought in the text itself: *διὰ τοῦ καταλογ[είου]* (ll. 11–12) demands the statement of cession (cf. *P. Harris*, 77; *BGU*, VII, 1565; Wilcken, *Chrest.*, No. 372).

13. The acc. *λοι(πὰς)* . . . *δραχ(μάς)* can hardly be right; the sense requires a gen. abs. or a nom.

141. Verso. Change *ἀποχ(ρεία)* to *ἀποχ(ή)*.

145. On the assumption that the stablemaster was a government official, the editors venture the view that at this period (sixth cent. A.D.) the government was paying wages in advance "to retain the services of employees." It is more likely that the person in question was serving one of the large private estates, like the renowned and extensive Apion estate (see E. R. Hardy, Jr., *The Large Estates of Byz. Egypt* [New York, 1931], pp. 106 ff.).

147. 4. *Αὐνᾶ ὡς Ἡράτι*, "Aunas also called Heras," is extraordinary, since *ὡς* is otherwise unknown in this meaning. I prefer *Αὐναῖος = Αὐνέως*, i.e., Aunes, grandfather of Apollonius (l. 3); but the position of the article before the father's name (l. 4) is then highly irregular.<sup>12</sup>

148. The date of the document as given in lines 22–24 is September 20, A.D. 171. 29. Restore *προθεῖν[αι]*, "publish." Like *πρόθε*, it is an order to hang out the bid for public notice. Thus an opportunity was offered others to enter higher bids.

153. 9. *χ(αίρειν)* is inappropriate at the end of a letter. The arrangement of line 6 suggests *χ(οῦν)*.

156. The date of the document as given in line 5 is December 3, A.D. 301.

162. 7. The reading suggests *[ἐκεῖ] καταγγέινουμαι*. No check is now possible because the document is temporarily unavailable.

163. Verso. *καμηλ(ῶνα)* is preferable to *καμηλ(εῖτην)*. Cf. the addresses in *P. Mich.*, III, 202 and 203.

164. A misinterpretation of line 8 has betrayed the editors into the commonplace observation that "outwitting the officials

<sup>11</sup> In criticism of my suggestion: *ἄ[ξι]ω σε ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων ἐ(π[ὶ] β[ούλῃ]) γὰρ μοι ἐπαπαγκάσαι κτλ.*, Johnson writes that the new restoration would not fill the space and rightly objects that the idiom requires *ἐπὶ τοῖς τόποις*. I now wish to propose for consideration *ἄ[ξι]ω σε, (ἀπει) ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων εἰ, β[οηθού]ν γὰρ μοι ἐπαπαγκάσαι κτλ.*

<sup>12</sup> Dr. Pearl suggests that *αὐναῖος* may be a scribal blunder for *ὁμοῖος*, which would make excellent sense.

seems a favorite pursuit of the Egyptian." This sport is, of course, dear to all conquered peoples, not to mention others, and Roman historians have long since given the Egyptians a bad name. A fresh translation of lines 2-8 will not come amiss: "You will do well immediately to give the nome-guard the draft [or payment: διαγραφήν] since you know the necessity of the monthly instalment, and with God's help, if we can, let us get past it without a fight." The tone may be resentful, but it bears also the stamp of resignation.

165. 1. Restore the vocative in place of the dative. For the vocative after χαίρεις see F. X. J. Exler, *A Study in Greek Epistolography* (Washington, 1923), p. 35.
12. Change ἐρρῶσ(θαι) to ἐρρωσο.
169. There is an a priori presumption against the view that "this letter seems to be written to the father of a young lady by a suitor." Romantic letters are rare in the papyri (see J. G. Winter, *Life and Letters in the Papyri* [Ann Arbor, 1933], pp. 129 ff.). Following the drift of line 5, I suggest that this was a begging letter. I should like to restore θλαμμασιδότητος in line 3 and render: "through experience itself I have become an admirer of your Excellency." The remnant of θ can no longer be seen on the papyrus, since, as often happens, a tiny piece along the edge has fallen off and disappeared.

The preparation of the ultimate volume in a papyrus series calls for energy and patience that are almost supernatural. We must feel humble before editors who bring such a project to a successful conclusion. They give a new glory to an old-fashioned phrase; they walk ἐν δόξῃ ἀληθείας.

HERBERT C. YOUTIE

University of Michigan

*An Introduction to Philo Judaeus.* By ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1940. Pp. xii+223. \$2.75.

Professor Goodenough is one of the few American scholars who have given much attention to Philo, and there can be no question of the thoroughness and completeness of his work in this field. He has written a number of books on Philo, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus*, *The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt*, *By Light, Light*; and much of the material in this *Introduction* is summarized from these larger and fuller treatises. In addition, he has appended to his work on the *Politics of Philo* a general bibliography in which he had the valuable collaboration of Mr. Howard L. Goodhart, of New York. The bibliography is nothing less than imposing in length and is all the more imposing because most of the books in it are contained in the private collection of Mr. Goodhart himself, which must be the largest Philonic collection anywhere in the world.

The *Introduction* is a short book, written in an easy and lively style. After a chapter in which the general method is set forth, Professor Goodenough rapidly reviews Philo's works, now available for English readers in the almost complete edition and translation by Professor F. G. Colson, published in the Loeb series. Nine of the ten volumes have already been published. Professor Goodenough next deals with Philo as a political thinker, a phase of Philo's activity which he makes more important than previous scholars have done. Then there are four chapters on Philo as a Jew, as a metaphysician, as a moralist, and as a mystic. In all cases Professor Goodenough has a definitely individual position, although he is fully conversant with the vast literature on the subject.

Philo, generally called Philo Judaeus, i.e., "Philo the Jew,"—to distinguish him from other well-known Philos, such as Philo of Byblos and Philo of Byzantium—was born in Alexandria around 20 B.C. and died there, probably after A.D. 40. Of his life we have only the extremely sparing hints in his own voluminous works and the few explicit statements in the writings of Josephus, who lived and wrote in the generation following his and from whom we learn that Philo was a member of a distinguished family, that he was the brother

of the fabulously wealthy alabarch, Alexander, and the uncle of Tiberius Julius Alexander, prefect of Egypt and procurator of Judaea, and that he was one of the heads of the embassy sent to Gaius by the Alexandrian Jews in A.D. 40.

Almost everything else we know about him—and this includes the transmission of his works—we owe to devout Christians who ranked him with the Apostolic Fathers. To many of them he was an *anima naturaliter Christiana*. Christian theology, both in the slightly unorthodox form which it assumed in Origen and in its fully orthodox form represented by Clement, Irenaeus, Eusebius, and Jerome, was largely determined by him. The only exception seems to have been Augustine, who sharply rejects as authority for Christians the doctrine of one who did not believe in Christ. But Augustine testifies to Philo's place in the theological tradition when he says that Philo is a permanent example of the fact that without faith the highest wisdom must fail to understand the revealed word of God. Both Protestant and Catholic theology have been profoundly influenced by Philo's method and doctrine. A recent Catholic writer, M. Louis (*Philon le Juif* [1911]), says of his work that it constitutes "un des grands événements de l'histoire du monde alexandrin et même de l'histoire universelle."

It was to this absorption of early Christian writers in him that we owe the legend of Philo's connection with Mark, the reputed founder of the first Christian community in Egypt. Indeed, a work ascribed to Philo, *De vita contemplativa*, which described an ascetic society of Therapeutae, was taken by Eusebius and later Christian writers to be an account of this first Christian church. And on this legend, no doubt, was built the supporting legend of a connection between Philo and Mark's teacher, Peter, a connection formed during an imaginary second visit of Philo in Rome.

Against Christian occupation with Philo we must place the fact that after Josephus, who was his younger contemporary, no extant Jewish writer until quite modern times makes the slightest reference to him. Some modern Jewish scholars, like Siegfried and Belkin, are

at great pains to prove the contrary. It cannot be said that they have been very successful, though they have obviously convinced themselves.

To a slight degree they have convinced Professor Goodenough. He finds in Philo, as he sets forth in all his books, and succinctly in this *Introduction*, a synthesis of a real Judaism and a real Hellenism, and in his view this synthesis is the basic stuff of Christianity. All it needs to be quite Christian is the "all powerful force of the personality of Jesus [p. xi]." This clearly is very much the position of Augustine. But, while Professor Goodenough finds the synthesis a necessary preparation for Christianity, Christianity, to Augustine, was not a synthesis at all.

As this preparation appeared in Philo, was it really a synthesis? That Philo, who bore among Christian writers merely the epithets of "Pythagorean" or "Platonist," was Greek, there is no doubt. Was there anything Jewish about him? It is extremely doubtful that he knew any Hebrew, and this doubt I do not find resolved by the vehement arguments of Dr. Belkin. He took part in a festival pilgrimage to Jerusalem, but certainly not more than one—which is significant, since there were three annual occasions (Exod. 23:12) and Alexandria was near enough to make the journey a light one. He could easily be called a Hellenist who attempted to force the material gleaned from the Septuagint into the framework of the scholastic philosophy of Alexandria, a philosophy saturated with what the century before and the century after Christ thought was the authentic teaching of Plato and Pythagoras. The chief technique for this purpose was an allegorizing and mystical interpretation of the texts, a technique which is an almost inevitable consequence of the need of applying a changeless and infallible revelation to a society in the process of rapid transformation. Analogous developments in China and India would not be hard to discover.

But the material Philo used was, after all, Jewish, and he maintained an attitude of unqualified veneration toward it. He certainly thought of himself as a Jew, and his conception of Judaism was a perfectly defensible one in

his own time, when there were many different types of Jewish doctrine and many diverse forms of Jewish life. Modern Judaism, however, is derived from only one of these types and one with which Philo had almost no concern, the type of which the characteristic later expressions were Talmud and Midrash and which produced the vast literature of medieval Judaism. This literature flowered into a new and fine scholasticism, quite different from that of Alexandria, although sharing with it certain methods that had become the intellectual heritage of the entire Western world.

Philo's sense of being a Jew might be called a sort of patriotism. In his case this patriotism was not a local matter. Philo, like other Alexandrians, both Jews and Greeks, profoundly disliked the Egyptians. His patriotism was that of an ethnic group. In the glories of Jewish history and in the perfection of the divinely established Jewish polity he took an inordinate and unphilosophic pride, as Athenians or Spartans did in their historical eminence. But this intense feeling of patriotic pride in no way qualified the complete acceptance of the imperium of the Roman people, since the Roman Empire neither then nor long afterward professed to be a state.

I find myself unable to accept Professor Goodenough's theory, frequently used as a key to the understanding of Philo's political doctrine, that Philo had a strong anti-Roman tendency which shows itself in covert allusions throughout his reference to government and law. Such covert references are unmistakable in the Talmud, after the Palestinian community had been crushed in the Bar Kosiba rebellion. But there is little warrant for finding them in Philo.

In two respects Philo was quite un-Greek. He had little sense of form and even less of humor. His style is heavily didactic, and, except for the *In Flaccum* and the *Legatio*, only a definite interest in the development of theology and hermeneutics would attract readers. Nonetheless, Professor Goodenough is eminently right in considering Philo a still imperfectly explored mine for the history of thought and religion.

Of the two worlds that met in Philo, I

should say that Professor Goodenough is more at home in that which centered in Jerusalem than in that which centered in Alexandria. At any rate, his renderings often seem to me to miss the sense of the text, sometimes to indicate a complete misconception of it. For example, I cannot see in the statement cited on page 105 any suggestion that Philo ascribed "monotheism to all pagans" or, indeed, that Colson in his note to the passage (*Sp. leg.* ii. 165; cf. VII, 408, n. d [Loeb ed.]) thought so. There is a vast difference between making Zeus the supreme god and making him the only one.

But, however widely one differs from Professor Goodenough in details, his researches have unquestionably opened up new vistas and stimulated a fruitful interest in the period and the person which he has made his own to so high a degree. Students of Hellenistic life and of Christian thought are under heavy obligations to him.

MAX RADIN

*School of Jurisprudence  
University of California*

*Essays on the Greek Romances.* By ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1943. Pp. xi+208. \$2.50.

Miss Haight has given us in this interesting volume a popular account of the five extant romances, a chapter about each, with an introductory chapter on their predecessors and two additional chapters on "Lucian and His Satiric Romances" and "A Comparison of the Greek Romances and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*." "My hope," she says, "in writing on the Greek Romances is that I may lure readers back to them."<sup>1</sup> The *Essays* furnish a convenient summary of what is known about the novels and their authors, with little of original contribution; the author quotes freely from previous writers, though she does not always agree with them and sometimes offers independent views (see, e.g., pp. 41, 80, 83, and 145).

In her introductory chapter (p. 2) Miss

<sup>1</sup> P. viii. Yet she uses untranslated Greek words at more than a dozen places, besides Latin quotations and several transliterations of Greek words.

Haight justly decries the fashion of belittling these novels; of emphasizing their similarities and ignoring their individual traits. Many of the characters have individuality, as she shows. Dionysius, Statira, and Artaxerxes in Chariton, Melitte in Achilles Tatius, Calasiris, Chariclea, and Arsace in Heliodorus, to name but a few, are not to be labeled "types." Two thousand years hence a reader of twentieth-century fiction—if a reader can still find any of it to read—will probably think that our novels are often monotonously alike, no matter what our reviewers say of them now. Miss Haight summarizes briefly the principal theories about origins and then reviews the new discoveries, drawing largely from Calderini, Gaselee, and Rattenbury, to whom she gives due credit.<sup>2</sup>

Each of the succeeding chapters, after a brief introduction on the author and his date, furnishes a résumé of the story, with a list of the characters, then a description of the characters and comments on the plot, style, and other interesting points. In examining each novel Miss Haight makes some comparison with the others, but this part is not detailed. In general, her judgments are sound and well balanced, though she is frankly an enthusiast. She praises the style of Chariton: "His style is usually Homeric in its brevity and simplicity" (p. 35); she credits him (p. 37) with having "carved out a new form of literature in his prose romance," thus making the common assumption that he had no important predecessor unknown to us. She likes Xenophon's style, too: "The style of this gem of a novel is finely cut, clear and beautiful in its pure Atticism" (p. 55). Yet (p. 56) "sometimes . . . the expression is double, as if in a sort of naïve elegance. Words are repeated awkwardly. Stereotyped formulae are used." Such qualities seem to this reviewer not to belong to a style "beautiful in its pure Atticism." She likens his writing to a movie script because of its breathless rush from one episode to another,

and she makes a specially interesting point of the story of "The Mummy in the House" at the beginning of Book v. She praises his "brevity, sincerity and restrained emotion" (p. 57) and finds that he "imitates certain passages in Chariton" (p. 40). After the complete overthrow of the theories of Rohde and others, who studied the interrelations of the novelists in the light of the old dating, one would expect scholars to be wary of positive statements of this sort. At present the papyrus fragments we have of Chariton are older than those of any other of the five; but this is not final proof that he is earlier than Xenophon. We have no ground for certainty that Xenophon is not the earlier. Though most students accept Bürger's conclusion<sup>3</sup> that we have but an epitome of Xenophon's romance, Miss Haight offers the interesting suggestion (p. 41) that it may possibly be "an intentionally short romance written briefly and simply by an author whose taste was akin to that of Chariton and who perhaps was intentionally showing a definite reaction against the verbosity of other [unextant] novelists."

Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius receive no praise for their style, though the words "vivid" and "charming" are slipped in incidentally, but the influence of the rhetorical schools on both is shown in some detail. She credits Achilles with "clear plot, living human beings, vivid settings for them, and exciting adventures" (p. 117).<sup>4</sup> Longus writes "poetic prose" (p. 138); he "has created a style peculiarly his own and suited to his pastoral romance." Miss Haight sees more humor in Longus than this reviewer.

Miss Haight finds that Lucian's "main ideals are frankness, truth and freedom" (p. 162). Contrasting the *True History* with the five extant romances, she says: "Romantic love does not figure in it. Religion has no place in it. Adventures are its bones and sinews" (p.

<sup>2</sup> K. Bürger, "Zu Xenophon von Ephesus," *Hermes*, XXVII (1892), 36-67.

<sup>4</sup> This reviewer is glad to find that Miss Haight supports his opinion of the parodic nature of the romance of Achilles Tatius: "Surely . . . thinly veiled satire" (p. 104); i.e., he is parodying them. See also p. 96, where she gives the impression that Rattenbury favors the parody theory, whereas he specifically rejects it in a passage which she quotes on p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> A. Calderini, *Caritone di Afrodizia: Le Avventure di Cherea e Calliroe* (Turin, 1913), pp. 3-227; S. Gaselee, "Appendix on the Greek Novel," in the edition of *Daphnis and Chloe and Parthenius* in the "Loeb Classical Library"; R. M. Rattenbury, "Romance: The Greek Novel," in J. U. Powell, *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature* (3d ser.; Oxford, 1933).



170). "Satire though this story is, it ranks easily first among imaginary voyages both in fantasy and style" (p. 175). And of the *Lucius* or *Ass* she writes: "Its greatest value . . . is that it outlines a contemporary Greek counterpart of the famous Latin novel, Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, and furnishes us with a touchstone for testing the pure gold of Apuleius' originality" (p. 145).

Chapter viii, on Apuleius, after the usual sketch of the author's life and a résumé of the story of the *Metamorphoses*, contrasts this "greatest ancient novel extant" (p. 186) with the books previously studied. She concludes that "his great novel is a synthesis of various types of Greek Romances" (p. 193); that it is not like them in plot but adopts all their devices. The book is full of adventures, introduces love in various inserted episodes, notably the Cupid and Psyche, and emphasizes religion even more than they. Apuleius is subjective, while they either are totally objective or possess but slight subjectivity. They at the end bring the hero back to the point where he started, while in Apuleius he is steadily progressing to the achievement of his quest.

Of Miss Haight's own rushing style one may say that it is characterized by asyndeton and a striking lack of punctuation. Some pages contain almost no commas. The effect is at times confusing. Her enthusiasm sometimes runs several paces ahead of cold fact, as when she tells the reader that Lucian is "the great satirist who through nearly all of the second century held up the mirror of his frankness to reflect images of the Greek and Roman world" (p. 144). He must have been a very precocious child. Several slight errors and inconsistencies may be noted. Chariton is from "Aphrodisia" (p. 15), though the correct Aphrodisias has already been used on page 12. Antonius Diogenes is dated "II-III century" on page 12 (cf. p. 199); yet he is the chief source of Lucian's *True History* (pp. 145, 171), though Lucian seems not to have lived to the end of the second century. When Cyno offered to kill her husband and marry Habrocomes, this hero did not at once refuse (p. 46), but at first pretended willingness. After the murder was accomplished, he balked. Odysseus in his

letter to Calypso did not say that he had always regretted leaving her; it was after his death that he repented, for she had offered him immortality (pp. 170, 174). It was the body, not the head, of Leucippe that Clitophon salvaged from the sea (p. 99).<sup>5</sup> We have five, not eight, books of Xenophon of Ephesus (p. 40). On page 39, line 12, *for soon read* recently. The spelling of Greek proper names is inconsistent, but there is not space here for details. Misprints are few; these may be listed: Lacedemon (p. 39), sparcity and Artemesion (p. 56), agnorisis (p. 79), Caldarini (p. 203), Colouna (p. 204). On page 14, n. 1, *for 1906 read 1900*, and *for both of the early III century read one of the II and the other II or III century*. On page 207 *s.v.* "Résumés," *for 107 read 177*.

The book is attractively bound and printed, and there is a very helpful Index.

DONALD BLYTHE DURHAM

Hamilton College

*Early Pythagorean Politics, in Practice and Theory.* By EDWIN L. MINAR, JR. ("Connecticut College Monographs," No. 2.) Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1942. Pp. 143. \$2.00.

The author has set himself a difficult task:

"The present study is an attempt first to trace the historical development of Pythagorean political activity (Chapters I-IV), then to indicate more briefly the main features of Pythagorean political theory as we know it, and something of the relationship between this and the more strictly 'philosophical' doctrine of the school (Chapter V)" [p. vi].

This program has been carried through with imagination and determination. But the reviewer questions whether in the present state of our exploration of this field it is possible to present a credible account of Pythagorean political history.

There is little in the literary sources on Pythagorean politics which can be treated as fact. Mr. Minar is critical, but the analysis of

<sup>5</sup> Here she has copied Phillimore's error, without verifying his statement (J. S. Phillimore, "The Greek Romances," in G. S. Gordon, *English Literature and the Classics* [Oxford, 1912], pp. 112-13).

the sources is not his first concern. As the demands of his narrative are felt and as assumptions are needed, the degree of authority to be assigned to the various late authors, or to the earlier sources in their uncertain quantities imbedded in the late authors, becomes a secondary matter. The transmission of the history of Pythagoreanism is still obscure, as Erich Frank has recently pointed out (*AJP*, LXIV [1943], 220-25). A reliable account of Pythagorean politics and philosophy must begin with the systematic analysis of the sources. Mr. Minar may still, and does, make interesting observations and suggestions.

Pythagoreanism in the political and social conflicts of the late sixth and the fifth centuries, according to the author, was aristocratic, oligarchic, and reactionary: "Pythagoreanism formed a sort of reactionary international . . ." (p. 38); "In summary, after the democratic uprising factional strife between the 'democrats' (i.e. the revolutionary party) and the 'oligarchs' (the aristocracy of birth and land headed by the Pythagoreans) continued to break out intermittently for an indeterminate length of time" (p. 79). The demos struggles to get free of its "Pythagorean incubus" (p. 81). Mr. Minar believes that "the Pythagorean Society was recognized as the real ruler in Croton and most of the cities of Magna Graecia" (p. 18). With the equation Pythagoreans = Croton he makes use of recent work in the history of southern Italy and the expansion of Croton becomes the history of Pythagoreanism (pp. 36-49). The author's confidence in his literary sources is reinforced by the evidence of coins (pp. 36 ff.).

The view taken here of Pythagorean politics differs widely from that taken by Delatte, who saw the Pythagoreans in an advisory capacity (pp. vi, 15, 17), and from von Fritz (*Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy* [New York, 1940], pp. 94 ff.), who finds analogous political action in Plato, the Academy, and Freemasonry of the eighteenth century. The complete skeptic's question, expressed by Frank (*op. cit.*, p. 225), whether we have any right to recognize a Pythagorean politics in a strict sense at all, is not reckoned with.

The equation Pythagoreans = Croton would

be an excellent one had it an adequate basis in the sources, but, so far as the reviewer can see, it has not. The story of the council of one thousand in Iamblichus (*VP* 254 ff.; cf. p. 56; cf. also von Fritz, *op. cit.*, pp. 58 ff.) is not conclusive. Pythagoreanism as militant power of the 1940 variety (cf. p. 48), a notion implied rather than expressed by Mr. Minar, is a product of his imagination. So long as Croton and Pythagoreans are not identifiable, the evidence of Crotonian coins is not relevant to Pythagorean history (cf. Frank, *op. cit.*) and the problem remains what it has been: How far are the literary sources reliable?

Evidences of liberalism in Pythagorean history (cf. Porphyry *VP* 22; p. 38) are treated to the "raised eyebrow." One, the case of Simichus, is ignored (cf. von Fritz, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 101). The *sententia* attributed to Aristoxenus, that rulers must be not only wise but lovers of men and that, in return, the ruled should be obedient and love their rulers, receives this comment: "A central point of Pythagorean strategy was to represent government as a favor and benefaction, the reward for which should be love, respect, and ready obedience" (p. 102). The government of Archytas in Tarentum, which our sources, such as they are, praise for its wisdom and humanity, is, as the author sees it, a reactionary one which has compromise forced upon it (pp. 90, 91, 98 ff.).

Mr. Minar looks with suspicion upon Pythagorean harmony and equality (pp. 118, 122). The one is not a balance of opposites but a cover for a political propaganda of authoritarianism: the other is a cunning exploitation of a geometric principle to obscure the true equality of man to man. Pythagorean advances in mathematical science and philosophy do not impress the author so much as the "deep-going hypocrisy" (p. 108). The Platonic *ἐπιστήμη*, it is implied, is a similar deception. How far Plato and Aristotle are to be included in the general charge is not clear: "No matter how conservative they are in general, these men did not belong to a group entrenched in power as did the Pythagoreans of the early days" (p. 101). The essential difference seems to be that they had less power.

If Pythagoreanism is to be convicted of reaction on the strength of its passion for order and precise distribution of power and function (pp. 89 ff.), the indictment will have a very wide range indeed, for Greek thought, political (aristocratic and democratic), philosophical, theological, and Greek art and literature sought to embody in their works principles of order and division. The aristocratic descent of ideals is not a mark of reaction.

A fragment attributed to Archytas, which states the relation of divine to human law, is quoted by Mr. Minar (p. 110) as an instance of the reactionary character of Pythagoreanism. The theme is a recurrent one in Greek literature. In the philosophers it is virtually a conception of natural law, to which is related the Pythagorean notion of the kinship of all nature (cf. Heracleitus 114; Empedocles 135; and *Vors.*<sup>5</sup> I, 366). The modern theory of democracy, based upon the theory of natural law which the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries inherited and developed from the past, thus may have some Pythagorean blood in its veins.

The author sees this history of the sixth and fifth centuries in terms of our day, as he has every right to do, so long as he is constantly on guard against the danger of oversimplification—a risk especially great in a problem so complex as Pythagoreanism. Professor Oldfather's statement that Pythagoras was "... a chief mover in the oligarchic reaction against democracy," quoted prominently (p. v), is a case in point.<sup>1</sup> Political cleavages in our day are made simply, and with justice as a basis for action; but they cannot be carried into the study of antiquity without careful consideration of terms. The author's free use of the terms "aristocrat," "oligarch," "reactionary," does not help us to sound conclusions about the character of Pythagorean politics and thought.

We owe something to Mr. Minar for a challenging exposition of conservatism in Pythag-

orean thinking. He has made a clear and well-thought-out statement of his case for the unity of Pythagorean politics and philosophy (cf. pp. 115 ff.). However, he recognizes only at times (p. 132) that Pythagoreanism is a complex affair; and, when he allows himself to follow the hypothesis, as he does consistently, that Pythagoreanism is political pressure first and that its achievements in philosophy and science are incidental to this purpose, he does his subject and himself less justice than they deserve.

ALISTER CAMERON

Bryn Mawr College

*Jesus in the Light of History.* By A. T. OLMSTEAD. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942. Pp. xiv+317. \$2.75.

With Jesus of Nazareth began the most important movement in the history of Western civilization, yet the task of describing historically his life and times is one of the most difficult and confused that any historian can face; and there is need for books that attempt it without theological preconceptions or commitments to special schools of criticism. Eduard Meyer made one approach twenty years ago in his *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, but the task was deliberately avoided by the *Cambridge Ancient History* (see XI, 265). In this book, though it is written on a scale and in a manner more especially suited to a semipopular audience, Professor Olmstead makes a contribution that is sure to stir both interest and criticism.

First, the purpose of the book demands that a good deal of space be given to descriptions of the historical and geographical background and to a good deal of archeological material, particularly about the Temple in Jerusalem. The way of life in Galilee, the readings in the synagogues, the rise of Aramaic and the use of the Targums, the characterizations of the House of Herod—these things are treated with the justness, vividness, and sympathy befitting a historian of the ancient Orient who is also a familiar sojourner in Bible lands. The author quite properly points out that, at the time of the death of John the Baptist, Salome

<sup>1</sup> On the slenderest evidence Mr. Minar (p. 7) describes Pythagoras when he arrives in Croton from Samos as a reactionary political agitator. Von Fritz (*op. cit.*, p. 17) believes he fled from Polycrates because "he thought it unbecoming a lover of liberty to submit to such a rule."

was probably married to Philip the tetrarch (p. 131; cf. A. H. M. Jones, *Herods of Judaea*, p. 181). He seems right in picturing Jesus in fear of arrest throughout much of his ministry and offers a good explanation of Antipas' refusal to take jurisdiction in Jerusalem at Jesus' trial. Some other points in the author's discussion of the general background seem more questionable. Successive Roman governors each issued his own edict but can hardly be said to modify the fundamental provincial law at his discretion (p. 39), since the *lex provinciae* remained beyond the governor's competence. The only evidence that the will of Attalus III of Pergamum was a forgery (p. 42) consists of Sallust's quotation from a letter of Mithridates the Great to Arsaces (*Hist.* iv. 69M), and a statement of Porphyrio on Horace, *Odes* ii. 18. 5. The will is mentioned in a contemporary inscription of Pergamum (*OGIS*, 338) and supported unanimously by the rest of the ancient sources. There is at least doubt that "God-reverencers" were a definite status (p. 46; cf. K. Lake, in F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I: *The Acts of the Apostles*, V, 80-88). The god of healing is Asclepius not "Aesclepias" (p. 157). Fulvia and Paulina (p. 192) were probably one and the same person (Rogers, *AJP*, LIII [1932], 252 ff.). These, however, are details and do not affect the main questions.

Critical students will examine with greatest interest the chronological indications found in the book and in the author's preliminary studies, and his use of the Gospel of John to support them. To the reviewer the date assigned to the Crucifixion, April 7, A.D. 30, seems a practical certainty. That assigned to the beginning of the ministry, December 18, A.D. 28, makes interesting use of the triennial cycle of readings in showing that Jesus read the passage for the sixty-second Sabbath in the synagogue at Nazareth. But is it sure that the complete cycle of readings was already fixed in the first century of our era? The evidence for this point is not adduced. Certainty regarding the date of Jesus' birth seems impossible of attainment, but there is some plausibility in the view that he was considerably older than is usually assumed.

The chronological scheme is still further conditioned by the prominence given to the Gospel of John. On this question the author writes: "The author's discovery that the narratives proper are fully trustworthy while the interpolations agree with the long sermons in the style and thought is the basis of this present life of Jesus" (p. 291). In 1924 Eduard Meyer wrote regarding John's source: "Im allgemeinen wird sie den zahlreichen apokryphen Evangelien gleichartig gewesen sein; doch enthielt sie vereinzelt noch wertvolle Nachrichten . . ." (I, 340); and in 1936 Canon Streeter wrote "The Gospel of John is not intended to be read as a biography. . . . The author draws material from Mark and Luke; doubtless also from independent tradition, though neither the extent nor the historical value of such tradition would seem great" (*CAH*, XI, 261). When agreement is so far from attained, there should be more argument before results can be generally accepted. Grant that acceptance of the order of John's narrative as in general chronological, compels as little harmonization and involves as few inconsistencies as any, a great doubt still remains, i.e., whether any of the writers were sufficiently interested in presenting the life and teachings of Jesus in chronological order to be relied upon. John seems right, as against the Synoptic Gospels, regarding the date of the Crucifixion. In his narrative the cleansing of the Temple comes soon after the commencement of Jesus' ministry, while the Synoptic Gospels all place it in Passion week. There is an undoubted advantage in placing the incident thus early, since it would explain why Jesus appears so quickly to become a sensation and to draw the attention of the Temple hierarchy and of Herod Antipas. Yet this is not the only possible explanation and can hardly be taken as certain, while the doubt about John's order remains. The author finds support for the early date of John's narrative in the fact that the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem and his descent from David are not mentioned to meet the sneer that no prophet comes from Galilee (John 7:52). Yet it is hard to conceive of any preaching of the Messiah without reference to the prophecies. He believes, however,

that the story was accepted before A.D. 40, when Caligula's order to place his statue in the Temple roused in the Christians a lively expectation of the Second Coming. Once again we are beset by lack of evidence regarding how the Christian community was affected by this order.

In general, therefore, this book contains interesting material, and in its picture of the setting has much to instruct and charm its readers. It advances some chronological conclusions of assured value and a number of suggestions of interest. In its use of the Gospel of John to supply the framework of the story it presupposes a view of the sources that requires further argument before it can be finally accepted or rejected.

T. ROBERT S. BROUGHTON

*Bryn Mawr College*

*The Vita Sancti Malchi of Reginald of Canterbury.* By LEVI ROBERT LIND. ("Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Vol. XXVII, Nos. 3-4.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1942. Pp. 245. Paper, \$3.00; cloth, \$3.50.

Although little is known about Reginald of Canterbury, it seems clear that his main literary activity was carried on toward the end of his life, that is, in the first decade of the twelfth century. His shorter poems have for some time been available for study in printed editions, but his long *Life of Malchus* until now has remained unpublished. The basic story for his "epic" he derived from Jerome's brief account of the hermit Malchus.

In a careful Introduction Mr. Lind puts together what little information can be gleaned from various sources about Reginald's life. There follows a summary of the poem and a description of the six manuscripts. Four contain the *Vita* in its longer form, one offers only excerpts, while the sixth, now at Merton College, Oxford, preserves a far briefer version of the poem. In a valuable discussion Mr. Lind seems to me to prove his point that this version was Reginald's original draft, which he later expanded by the addition of much material only remotely connected with his main topic. Mr. Lind also gives strong reasons for regard-

ing the *Commendatio domus oceani* (*Vita* iv. 243-585) as Reginald's own and not as an insertion from Alberic of Monte Cassino (see pp. 20 and 215). Reginald's sources are also discussed in the Introduction, and a good many parallels are cited in the commentary that follows the poem. For reasons that will become apparent later in this review I doubt whether Reginald's acquaintance with the classical poets of Rome was as extensive as Mr. Lind seems to think.

Mr. Lind prints the text of the full poem and also the shorter version; by numbers in the right-hand column throughout the longer poem the reader is shown perspicuously which lines come from the original draft and which were subsequently added, when Reginald decided to enlarge his earlier version. One is grateful to Mr. Lind for having provided a careful text of both versions, especially as the longer one makes up for what it lacks in poetic inspiration by a great deal of crabbed Latinity.

Mr. Lind's commentary, however, is disappointing, and it is not always clear what type of reader he had in mind when he composed it. While some lines in the poem are so obscure that an English rendering in the notes is justified, others certainly did not need translation (e.g., i. 15 and 17, 126, 280). Why waste a note on *ast* (ii. 227)? And, if it seemed desirable to comment on certain Christian heresiarchs, surely something less elementary than the note on vi. 475 was called for. The chief criticism, however, that the commentary provokes is that Mr. Lind's treatment of Reginald's prosody and language is very inadequate. His remarks on page 225 seem to assume that the norm by which to judge Reginald as a versifier is the prosody of the classical Latin poets. But to treat the Leonine hexameter simply as the poor relation of the Virgilian is as unsound in method as to treat medieval Latin as a broken-down version of the classical idiom. What Mr. Lind should have done was to summarize Reginald's metrical usage in the light of regular medieval practice and also to indicate aberrations of this—for instance, the occasional lapse into the license of rhythmic verse (cf. *Malchi* scanned as a pyrrhic in i. 48 and 85). The lengthening of short *a* and *e*, both



on the ictus and occasionally elsewhere, should have received some attention. And, indeed, Mr. Lind's knowledge of metrical license in classical poetry is not impeccable; if it were, he would not have proposed the absurd scansion of iii. 28 and iv. 468. *Pariete* is a dactyl, the *i* being consonantalized. See *Georgics* iv. 296 and also *Aeneid* ii. 16, where *abiete* is similarly treated. Mr Lind's scansion of iii. 383 seems very doubtful. *Ortigometra* is one of the many words that Reginald picked from a glossary and, on the analogy of words like *robigo*, probably scanned as a spondee followed by a dactyl. The truth is that Reginald is not greatly different in his versification from other medieval versifiers. But Mr. Lind has not made this clear, because he ignores the Christian Latin poets, who form a bridge from classical to medieval times, and, save for a few allusions to Hildebert of Le Mans, he passes over in silence medieval poets before Reginald's time. Even a brief perusal of one or two works, like Bede's versified *Life of St. Cuthbert* or the *Ecbasis captivi* in Strecker's admirable text, would have proved enlightening.

I have referred to glossaries. Reginald's poem abounds in glossary-words, and here, too, he had predecessors, for instance, Abbo of St. Germain-des-Prés (cf. *Bulletin Du Cange*, I [1924], 27-31). Consider, for example, the passage in *Vita* iii. 55 ff. *Pincerna, salisatores, histrio, bibitores, calamistrati, geruli* all appear in the *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum*; and there are a great many more scattered throughout the poem, like *architriclinium, conopeis, polymita, bracteoli, salsugo, arctophylax, simmistes*. The -es form of the last word is attested in the glossaries as well as the -a form. Reference to the same source would have shown Mr. Lind that *girant* (iii. 51) and *ringit* (v. 70) could be used intransitively (*gyrare: circumire* and *ringo: os aperio*). The use of this glossarial material by Reginald has a twofold importance: it illustrates his method of versification, and it also makes it more than doubtful how far Mr. Lind's parallel passages from classical poets are pertinent. Undoubtedly, Reginald had some acquaintance with them, especially Virgil; but he is likely to have taken some of his material from glossaries rather than have

culled them from the ancient poets directly. The medieval glosses on the text, printed by Mr. Lind in the notes, also deserve more attention than they have received. Some of them can be partly or wholly paralleled in the earlier glossaries, some seem to derive from grammarians. The whole topic deserves investigation. Mr. Lind has no comment on *pygarum* (iv. 222) but prints the winsome gloss, *pige sunt puellae sine natibus*. Here is clear proof that Reginald used a glossary and that the glossary which he consulted contained corrupt glosses, as most medieval glossaries did. Clearly, the original gloss must have read, *apygae*, etc. See *CGL*, II, 243. 50, and 584. 40—*ἄπυγος: inpuget; inpuget qui minores naticas habet*.

M. L. W. LAISTNER

Cornell University

*Nonnos Dionysiaca*. With an English Translation by W. H. D. ROUSE, Mythological Introduction and Notes by H. J. ROSE, and Notes on Text Criticism by L. R. LIND. 3 vols. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1940-42.

In these three volumes Dr. Rouse gives us the first English translation of Nonnus' epic. The great bulk of the work and Nonnus' often sophisticated style made the task a laborious and exacting one. The translation is, on the whole, not only accurate but readable; Professor Rose's notes, elementary though many of them are, will no doubt be as welcome to other readers as they were to me; and Dr. Lind's discussion of "Recent Text-Criticism of the *Dionysiaca*" with the accompanying bibliography is a helpful presentation of material otherwise difficult of access.

The translation is at first sight somewhat disconcerting; it is on occasion perhaps unnecessarily free; and several times the colloquial and even jocular tone of the English seems scarcely consonant with Nonnus' epic dignity of diction. Even in a taunting speech (i. 335 f.) *δφρα λοχέυσθ' / ἰσοφνῇ τινα ταῦρον δημοκράτῳ παρὰ κούτῃ* is surely not "she might have bred you a little bull as horny as his father!" nor is Artemis "puppybreeder" when she is called

σκυλακοτρόφος (xlvi. 415). Greek compound epithets are translated by such English compounds as "Seabluehair" for *κυανοχαίτης*, "Grayeyes" for *γλαυκῶπις*, and even "Shake-spear" for *δορυσσοός* (xxv. 269). In time one becomes accustomed to most of these and even comes to take pleasure in their idiomatic brevity.

There are felicitous touches too numerous to quote in full: thus in iii. 309 *δυσπένθερα θεσμά τοκῆος*, "her father's commands,—that bad goodfather!" we have an oxymoron in Nonnus' own vein.

It is almost inevitable that in translating so bulky a work a few slips and errors should have been made. Among others I have noted the following:

In i. 231, "travelling fellows" for *ἀντιπόρους* . . . *ἀλήμενας* scarcely seems to convey the notion that the planets travel in a direction opposite to that of the fixed stars (cf. V. Stegemann, *Astrologie und Universalgeschichte* [Berlin, 1930], p. 37); similarly in i. 498, *ἀντιθέοντας ἀλήτας* is translated "racing planets." In ii. 589, "no trident in his hand but a cup for you if you are thirsty" for *διψάδι χειρὶ φέροντα τεὸν δέπας ἀντὶ τριαινῆς* appears excessively free, when the point is that Poseidon's hand is no longer wet but dry. In iii. 225, *ὅπωπαί* is surely "appearance," not "eyes." In iv. 266, *Μεμφιδὸς ἐνναέτης* is not "dwelt nine years in Memphis" but "indweller of Memphis." In vii. 165, *τράγον* is "he-goat," not "boar." In ix. 23, *καὶ θεὸν ἀρτιλόχετον ἐφήμισαν Εἰραφιώτην* is not "So he dubbed Zeus newly delivered Eiraphiotes" but "they [i.e., men] dubbed the god [Dionysus] newly delivered Eiraphiotes." In xii. 35, *γραφίδων* is "tablets," not "pencil" (cf. ii. 114). In xii. 97 f., *Κισσὸς ἀεσιπότης, ἐρβείας νέος, εἰς φυτὸν ἔρπων/ἔστα κισσὸς ἔλιξ καὶ ἐν ἔρνεσιν* is probably not "And Cissos, the lovely youth, shall creep into a plant, and he shall be the highflying ivy that entwines about the branches" but "... he shall be twining cissos [ivy] even [when he is] in [the form of] branches." In xv. 88, the *πετρὸν οὐλον* of Hypnos is not "vigorous wing" but, rather, "baleful" or possibly "thick." In xxi. 174, "winepouring" for *οἰνοφύτω* looks like a misreading of the word as *οἰνοχύτω*. In the *ἐπιγρα-*

*φή* of Book xxii (*Δεύτερον εἰκοστὸν Βρομίον μόθον ἔργα τε μέλπει, Αἰακὸς ὅσσα τέλεσσε καὶ ἐν πεδίῳ καὶ Ἰθάσῃ*), *ὅσσα* is probably to be taken with *ἔργα* and the comma after *μέλπει* to be omitted; the translation is, then, "The twenty-second sings of the battle toil of Bromius and the deeds Aeacus accomplished both on the plain and in the Hydaspes" rather than "The twenty-second celebrates the battle and feats of Bromios, all the deeds of Aiacos both on the plain and in the Hydaspes." In xxiii. 120, *Ἀντολίη*, since it refers to India, is "East" rather than "Anatolia." In xxvi. 338, *ἐκροή-δεμνον Ἐριστοβάρειαν* appears to be a city: the epithet then would be "well-battlemented" and not "with her lovely coronals." In xxxiv. 126, *ἐντροχάλων ἀπὸ λέκτρων* is probably a reminiscence of Homer's *δινωτοῖσι λέχεσσι* (I 391), although the suggestion in the note that the Indians were in caravans is possible. In xxxv. 361 f., *εἴκελα δεσμά φέροντα, τὰ περ μετὰ κύματα λυσσῆς/Νυσιάδες βοῶσι θεοδῆες εἰσέτι Νύμφαι* is "... which the Nysiad Nymphs, still godfearing [even] after my madness, tell of" rather than "... which the divine Nysiad Nymphs, now that the surges of madness are over, still tell of." In xxxvi. 46, *χαμαὶ κατέχευε φαρέτην* is not "emptied her quiver upon the ground" but "let it fall" (the quiver is already empty: cf. l. 34). In xxxviii. 247, *ἐπικύρτος* of the moon would be translated more clearly "gibbous" (i.e., "convex") than "curved." In xxxviii. 250-53, *Ζωδιακὴν περὶ νύσσαν ἀτέρμονα κύκλον ὁδεῖω, / τίκτων μέτρα χρόνοις, καὶ οἰκοθεν οἶκον ἀμείβων/καὶ τελέσας ἓνα κύκλον ὅλον λυκάβαντα κομίζω* is "I [the Sun] . . . traverse an endless circuit about the turning-point of the Zodiac, creating measures of time both when I move from one house to another and when, having completed one circuit, I bring the year" rather than "... when I have completed one whole circle passing from house to house I bring off the lichtgang." The passing from house to house marks the month (roughly); the complete circuit, the year. In xxxviii. 274, *χηλαῖς ἐν διδύμησιν* refers to the "Claws" (of the Scorpion), the older name for Libra, and is not "the two hooves." In xli. 350, *φαίνων* is a name for the planet Saturn and should be spelled with a capital and translated accord-

ingly. In xlii. 169, ἐπεὶ πόθον οὐ μάθε κούρη is rather "did not recognize his desire" than "knew not desire." In xliii. 57 f., μελαγχαίτης 'Ελικάων/ξανθοφύης ροδῆρσι παρήσιον, "black-hair Helicaon, a blond man with rosy cheeks," demands some sort of explanation. Presumably it refers to the ivy with dark leaves and yellow or saffron berries (cf. Olck, *RE*, V, 2828. 52-65); there is also a play on 'Ελικάων and ἔλιξ. In xlv. 124, λυχνίδος is "ruby," not "light." In xlvii. 490, ἐπεμαίνετο is "grew mad with," not "was stained with."

A few passages in the notes are misleading, inadequate, or wrong. For example, we are told (I, 189) that Ἀργεὺς is "a title of Apollo"; in the text (v. 289) the reference is no doubt to Aristaeus (cf. also v. 215). In I, 242, "zenith" and "nadir" are more than the "upper" and "lower culmination" implied by Nonnus. In I, 260 (vii. 209), the "father's sister" of Semele is Europa not Hera. In I, 260 (viii. 12), it is scarcely an elucidation of an epithet of "nymphs" to be told "Dionysos was called Cisseus." One is inclined to assume some such sort of play on κισσός and κίσσα, as that hinted at by Eustathius on Dionysius Periegetes (p. 287. 3-6 [Bernhard]). It is rather venturesome to assert, as does the note in I, 458, that "η and υ were pronounced exactly alike by Nonnos's time"; the evidence available is by no means decisive (cf. E. H. Sturtevant, *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin* [2d ed.; Philadelphia, 1940], pp. 43 f.). The note in III, 195, surely goes a little out of the way in explaining the epithet "Gamos" as having been applied to Helios by Nonnus because a fragment of Philoxenus calls Gamos most brilliant (λαμπρότατε) of the gods; the Sun is the source of all life on earth and could surely for this reason alone be styled Gamos. The note in III, 227 (xli. 415), is misleading in saying of "Amynone": "Otherwise unknown, not daughter of Danaos." Amynone is but another name for Βερόη (cf. ἐπιγραφή of Book xli; xli. 153; xlii. 412, 464, 521).

None of the misprints is likely to cause difficulty, except possibly τῆ (xii. 264) for τῷ; βουβήεσσα (xiv. 422) for βομβήεσσα; ἐρτοίητο (xxx. 313) for ἐπτοίητο. In I, 55, note c, "her father's" should no doubt be read for "his

father's"; in the translation (xxxvii. 233 [III, 53. 26]) "Damnameneus" should be read for "Damnamenes"; "Aonian" should be read for "Aionian" (xlv. 51 [III, 325. 1]); in III, 183. 19 "were" seems to have dropped out after "heights" in the translation.

BENEDICT EINARSON

University of Chicago

*The People of Aristophanes: A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy.* By VICTOR EHRENBURG. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1943. Pp. xii+320+19 pls. 25s.

The scope and purpose of this book by the former professor of ancient history at Prague are clearly indicated by the subtitle. Chapters on "Old Comedy" and "The Comedies" are followed by others dealing with the subjects normally taken up in studies of Athenian social and economic conditions. While other sources have not been neglected, the extant comedies and fragments have been combed systematically. The result is a book which will interest students both of Aristophanes and of Athenian social and economic history. The arrangement adopted has made it possible to give a vast amount of information in relatively small space. The references to passages in the comedies—and sometimes to other sources—are given in parentheses, while notes containing discussions and references to further literature are assembled toward the end of the volume (pp. 266-89). These are followed by a chronological table of comedies (pp. 290-93), a very brief general index (pp. 294 f.), and an index of passages of sources cited (pp. 296-319). The illustrations for the plates have been chosen with discrimination. The printing and paper are good for 1943.

The writing of this book has not been easy. The evidence of comedy has the advantage that it is given incidentally and so is less likely to be distorted. As Ehrenberg remarks, "Nowhere but in comedy are the facts of social and economic life given merely as a background and to create an atmosphere" (p. 6). Yet the advantage may be less than it seems at first. Even the color of a picture "given merely as a background and to create an atmosphere"

will be affected by the outlook and point of view of the author. There is the additional difficulty of distinguishing between what can be taken literally and what is comic distortion or caricature. In all such matters the author has used discretion and shown good judgment. The same can be said for his handling of social and economic problems. As a whole, he steers a middle course and avoids extremes.

Yet, in a sense, the results are disappointing. Scholars who have studied the problems involved, even if they have not personally undertaken research on them, are likely to lay the book down with a feeling that they have learned little that is new. They will have had additional evidence on certain points brought to their attention, and they will have profited from a new approach to old problems, but their general views will remain much the same as they were. The evidence adduced simply does not supply definitive solutions for old problems. The reason is clear. While earlier scholars may not have gone over Old Comedy as systematically as Ehrenberg, they have made use of it. What would our sketches of Athenian law courts in the fifth century look like if the material derived from Aristophanes were subtracted? Or who has ever given serious thought to the general economic status of Athenian citizens without taking the evidence of comedy into consideration? Even so, there is reason for being grateful to Professor Ehrenberg for his interesting account.

There is another reason for disappointment. To be sure, it is only natural that there should be points which will cause disagreement and instances in which some evidence has been overlooked. Sometimes mere trifles are involved, but it is hard not to feel that the author has been guilty of some rather serious errors. In connection with the use of mercenaries during the Peloponnesian War (p. 223), it is surprising not to find the *Acharnians* 153 ff. cited. In the brief discussion of political parties on page 288 (chap. xiii, n. 1) one misses any reference to the 190 ostraca apparently prepared by an opponent of Themistocles for distribution among the voters (O. Broneer, *Hesperia*, VII [1938], 228-43). On page 72, *Hell. Ox.* 12. 5 is used as evidence for agricul-

tural recovery in the fourth century instead of as evidence for conditions before the Spartan occupation of Decelea. In connection with the registration of dicasts in several sections it should not even be suggested as a possibility that it was done "in order to get more than one salary" (p. 242). Surely, not even Aristophanes' dicasts could sit in more than one court at a time. Nor is "salary" the best word for pay given for a single day's service and payable only to those actually present on the particular day. On page 137 the statement of Pseudo-Xenophon 1. 10 ff. concerning slaves is summarized, and its accuracy is then tested by evidence from comedy. The summary contains the statement: "Nobody was allowed to beat a slave." Later it is maintained that "flogging was certainly the usual punishment" (p. 139). Pseudo-Xenophon, however, does not deny this but merely affirms that it is forbidden to strike and abuse other people's slaves (cf. the commentary on the passage in E. Kalinka's edition [Leipzig, 1913]). At least one other statement on slavery is unsatisfactory. On page 129 "the rowing slaves" are mentioned as public slaves, and it seems implied that the rowers normally were slaves. "In case of emergency their ranks were filled up, or they were replaced, by citizens (Thuc. III 18, 4; Xen. *hell.* I 6, 24)." The evidence cited does not prove this. In Thuc. iii. 18. 4 the point is not that citizens served as rowers but that the hoplites did the rowing themselves, while in Xen. *Hell.* i. 6. 24, where it is stated that both slaves and freemen were made to serve, there is nothing to indicate that the service of freemen was unusual. As for the evidence cited from the *Frogs* for "rowing slaves" at Arginusae, this itself implies that the slaves in question were not public but privately owned. There is an entirely different and more correct statement concerning rowers on pages 213 f.

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

*Theophrastea: Studien zur botanischen Begriffsbildung.* By REINHOLD STRÖMBERG. ("Kungl. Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Samhälles Handlingar," Femte Följden, Ser. A,

Vol. VI, No. 4.) Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerbers Förlag, 1937. Pp. 235. Kr. 15.

This study of Greek semasiology and terminology, based upon the phytological works of Theophrastus, is useful not only to the student of the history of science, particularly of botanical science, but to Hellenists in general. The historian of botany will be unwise hereafter to treat, in any vocabulary sense, of the writings of the second greatest Peripatetic without observing what Strömberg, on page after page of logical and sequential method, has shown to be the true sense of many technical terms of ancient plant studies as exemplified in Theophrastus. Numerous notes and comments call attention to translations and interpretations that need revising, specifically in Liddell-Scott-Jones and in the Theophrastean studies of Bretzl and Hindenlang. In the second place, all Hellenists, in a field of study in which identification of the plants themselves is now practically certain, have here an unusually objective control of the accuracy and fitness of a specific group of Greek technical terms and descriptive words; and the development of meanings furnishes a fresh and attractively satisfying methodology in semantics, involving much less than the usual amount of guesswork.

The author has brought to his study, not alone training under such specialists as Regenbogen and Senn, but direct field study, for nearly a year, of Mediterranean flora, as he botanized first in Italy in 1933 and then in Greece itself in 1936 ("... die von Theophrast behandelten Pflanzen aus eigener Anschauung kennenzulernen ... in Griechenland—Attika, Peloponnes, Thessalien, Kreta, Chios und Lesbos—und in der Türkei—Ephesos, Smyrnen, Edremit ...").

The first section of the book (pp. 15-43) is a general introduction in three chapters. Of these, the first reviews Greek botany from its beginnings to Aristotle and Theophrastus. The second chapter, within a brief compass (pp. 23-36), is an excellent summary of Peripatetic concepts in their development, first, those of Aristotle, then those of Theophrastus: in the former, man is the point of comparison for animals; in the latter, the tree for plants.

Type (*τύπος*) and its subconcepts, *θέσει* versus *τάξει*, analogy between animals and plants, particularly with respect to parts (*μέρη*), lead to a comparison of the conceptual basis of Aristotle's thinking with that of Theophrastus. In much of this the findings are those of Gustav Senn in his more recent treatises; but the approach is different, the emphasis being linguistic and conceptual rather than methodologic and phytologic as with the Basel botanist.

We are now ready for the intensive semasiologic study to which Strömberg devotes Part II, consisting of an introduction and six chapters, the major part of the work (pp. 45-136). For example, the study of *ρίζα* and its compounds, such as those formed with *ὑπο-*, is approached by a study of the terms themselves in earlier authors—as well as more intensively throughout Theophrastus—and proceeds, by inclusion and exclusion, to show convincingly that *ὑπόριζος* everywhere means "provided with slight roots," never "rooted at the bottom," which latter Liddell-Scott-Jones gives as a possible meaning.

The chief plant parts are taken as headings for similar excursions: *ρίζα*, pp. 58-94; *καυλός* and *στέλεχος*, pp. 95-113; *ἴς* and *φλέψ* (a star chapter!), pp. 129-36. It is interesting to observe that those words for which Theophrastus senses most clearly a specific (we should say "scientific") meaning are those most productive of compounds.

The last main division—four chapters and a conclusion (pp. 139-74)—is, as might be expected, a casting of the author's view over the whole, philosophically: wealth and poverty of vocabulary for plant parts; relativity of concepts; the natural plant system in Theophrastus; remarks on Theophrastus' vocabulary creation. In this section are to be found many gems of musing thought. One or two quotations must suffice.

Es handelt sich also bei Theophrast keineswegs um eine Unsicherheit in der sprachlichen Benennung oder in der begrifflichen Auffassung, sondern um eine bewusste Bildung relativer Begriffe mit einem festen Kern ohne scharfe Grenzen [p. 151].

Theophrast behandelt die Botanik überhaupt viel konkreter als Aristoteles die Zoologie und



verwendet die typologische Forschungsmethode viel bewusster als sein Lehrer. Der *trópos* ist nach meiner Meinung für die ganze Haltung des Theophrast ausserordentlich wichtig [p. 152].

Valuable tables are inserted in the book: after page 72 a comparison of terms for roots—of the moderns, ancient Arcadians, "Ida dwellers," and Theophrastus; at page 89 a chronologic comparison from Homer to Aristotle of Theophrastus' words in *ποιός*; a kind of lemma (after p. 158) of Theophrastus' classification of plants (*ποιώδη*) in Book viii of *HP*; similarly for ivy (*ibid.* iii. 18. 6 ff.) on page 160. There are smaller *lemmata* scattered through the pages, all of help in clarifying the concept relations. Two supplements—on plant-part names becoming plant names and on the terminology of plant diseases—occupy pages 183–95.

The work concludes with a valuable and inclusive list of literature (pp. 199–216); a thorough Greek index (pp. 221–30); a subject index (pp. 230–32); and a list of plants and plant groups (pp. 233 f.).

Obviously, to present a detailed review of a work like this is comparable to reviewing a dictionary; but, it is hoped, enough has been said to indicate for the two groups of Hellenists mentioned in our first paragraph, especially with those who are concerned with the language itself (which should certainly include us all), that here is a work to be reckoned with. To the great names in modern Theophrastus studies, Gustav Senn of Basel and Otto Regenbogen of Heidelberg, must now be added that of Reinhold Strömberg.

ROBERT E. DENGLE

*The Pennsylvania State College*

*Oxyrhynchus: An Economic and Social Study.*

By HUGH MACLENNAN. (Dissertation, Princeton University.) Princeton, 1935. Pp. 93.

The purpose of this dissertation, in the words of the author, is "to trace from a social and economic standpoint the history of its [i.e., of Oxyrhynchus'] growth and decline through the seven centuries during which it was subject to the Caesars." "To do this," he

states, "is more or less to look at Roman provincial life through the large end of a telescope."

The sources of information are, for the most part, Greek papyri from Oxyrhynchus and, in particular, those edited by Grenfell, Hunt, and Bell. In the extensive use of the latter, translations of the editors are quoted, the author giving his own version only in the case of non-English publications. There is little attempt at original interpretation, but frequently agreement with Rostovtzeff is expressed and his *Social and Economic History* cited.

Carelessness and inability to make proper use of source material are evident. On page 12 we read: "As for the Jews, it is clear that there were many in Egypt and that they controlled a considerable part of the business life of that province, but they tended to be exclusive and regarded the Greeks as alien." In support of this statement *P. Oxy.*, IX, 1205, is cited. This document is a "Manumission *inter amicos*"; and, although Jews in part are concerned, it certainly does not warrant the sweeping assertion that is made.

The career of a certain Aurelius Serenus who became a wealthy landlord is traced over several pages (42–45) and reference made to a number of papyri. A perusal of these is enlightening. In *P. Oxy.*, X, 1276, 3–4 (A.D. 249), a contract of sale of house-property, Serenus' name is given as *Ἀυρήλιος Σερήνος ὁ καὶ Σαραπίων Ἀγαθεῖνος μητρός Ταποσειριάδος*. A name, written so completely once, should always serve as a warning against accepting anything less complete as referring to the same individual. But the author is not to be deterred by such detail. *PSI*, VIII, 886 (A.D. 311/312?), is cited to show that in that year Serenus became strategus. Now the fact that he necessarily would have been at least sixty-two years old in 311 (that many years having passed since the contract of sale mentioned above was written), and reasonably seventy-five or eighty, should have aroused some suspicions regarding the identity of the individuals in the two documents. Further, if the Introduction to this papyrus had been read, reference to the Serenus there mentioned would have been found in the following terms, "strategus (Au-

relius?) Sarapion alias Serenus, non altrimenti noto." Finally, the text itself has [Αύρηλιω?] Σαραπίωνι τῷ καὶ Σερήνῳ στρατηγῷ. *PSI*, VII, 790, is also taken as referring to the same man, although the text has [Αύρηλ?] ἰω Σερήνῳ; likewise, *ibid.*, V, 461, reading Σαραπίωνι δὲ καὶ Σερήνῳ, the former dated *not* in the early part of the fourth century, as the author states, but in the *sixth* (?).

On page 53 we read: "Unquestionably Christianity was growing rapidly. But it is necessary to correct Milne's statement that in the middle or late fourth century the whole town of Oxyrhynchus was under monastic vows." Evidently the first edition of Milne's *A History of Egypt under Roman Rule* was used, although we are not informed of that fact, for a look into the third edition (1924) reveals that he had modified his original statement to "practically all the inhabitants of some towns, such as Oxyrhynchus, were said to be under monastic vows."

Two noticeable mistakes in English occur, one orthographic, the other grammatical. On page 21 is found, "unstinted provisions of un-gents," and on page 25, "... danger of them being ruined. ...." Both of these appear, despite the fact that they are in quotations originally correct.

The work is divided into eight chapters and concludes with a brief Bibliography and Index.

VERNE B. SCHUMAN

Indiana University

---

*Quintus Aurelius Symmachus and the Senatorial Aristocracy of the West.* By JOHN ALEXANDER McGEACHY, JR. (Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1942.) Private edition, distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago, 1942. Pp. iv+203.

Dr. McGeachy complains that the literary remains of Symmachus might have been, but for the fatuity of their author, a veritable mine of historical material to aid us in examining one of the principal problems of history, the causes for the collapse of the ancient world. Yet he seems to be remarkably successful in

exhuming a great amount of material bearing upon that very subject, which he presents in a well-written dissertation, some chapters of which make fascinating reading. The avowed purpose of his study—"to fit the contributions of the life and works of Symmachus into a general picture of the Senatorial aristocracy of the Late Roman Empire"—we feel has been well fulfilled.

To the present reviewer the second, third, and fourth chapters on the political, economic, and social aspects of the senatorial aristocracy contain the most valuable contributions. The other chapters seem burdened with a philological aridity that probably no man can entirely escape in covering certain necessary aspects of any doctoral dissertation, let alone one on Symmachus.

Chapter ii presents an excellent account of the administrative impotence at which the senatorial aristocracy had arrived. It also contains a fine discussion of the rivalry between the aristocracy "as the owners or controllers of most of the landed resources in the western part of the Empire" and the imperial government, and an "analysis of . . . the relationship between the aristocracy and the Empire—the political phase of that conflict of interests which tended to separate imperial government and landed nobility, and to produce consequences which finally resulted in the dissolution of the Empire in the West." This discussion is further developed in the next chapter, on the economic aspect of the senatorial class and its relations with the imperial government and the other classes of the Empire.

The chapter on the social life of the aristocracy leaves one with a most unpalatable impression of the utter triviality of the lives of "the better part of the human race," as Symmachus designates his own order. And, although one might not expect the social consciousness of our own era to form a part of the complacent hauteur of a senatorial aristocrat of the fourth century, still Symmachus' contempt for the lower classes, for slaves, and for misfortune and misery is shocking in a person who represents a high level of pagan morality and against whom no instance of personal immorality can be charged. One gets an impres-

sion of a social order far too decadent to possess any human value and is left with the conviction that the triumph of the Christian church, for which Symmachus never betrays any comprehension or sympathy, not only saved the better part of the ancient civilization from utter destruction but added a new and finer element to human society.

In his brief discussion of Symmachus and the religious question, the author is occupied primarily with the economic and social aspect of the struggle, the purely religious issue having been thoroughly discussed elsewhere; and he convincingly shows that class prestige and not the ancient worship was what primarily concerned the pagan portion of the Roman aristocracy.

Space does not permit mention of the other sections of the dissertation, which are less valuable as original contributions and in part but a résumé of aspects of Symmachus' works which have often been discussed before. The long digression on the authorship of the *Historia Augusta* seems to me, as it does to the author, extraneous to the subject matter of the dissertation.

GEORGE R. MONKS

University of Michigan

*Dionysiac Sarcophagi in Baltimore.* By KARL LEHMANN-HARTLEBEN and ERLING C. OLSEN. Published jointly by the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, and the Trustees of the Walters Art Gallery. Baltimore, 1942. Pp. 82+45 illus. at end.

This book deals with seven sarcophagi which are among the more notable treasures of the Walters Art Gallery and with two others in the Museo Nazionale in Rome. General views of seven of the nine were published in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* in 1885 and 1888; but, except for the "Triumph Sarcophagus," the new illustrations are better, and they show the sarcophagi much more completely. A number of other monuments are illustrated for comparison. The two authors worked in close collaboration, but Lehmann-Hartleben was concerned chiefly with subject matter and religious interpretation, Olsen

with stylistic analysis. It is concluded, in brief, that the sarcophagi were made for a single family belonging to a Bacchic cult community in which, specifically, the cult of Dionysos-Sabazios was dominant; and that the series extends from ca. A.D. 138 to ca. A.D. 210. The discussions are scholarly and thorough and contain much that is valuable, not only for the immediate subject, but for wider fields in Roman religion and Roman art. The style is a little pompous in some passages, but generally clear. It would have facilitated hasty consultation if the sarcophagi had been numbered as well as named.

The circumstances in which they were found deserve some attention. In November, 1884, a sepulchral chamber containing several funereal altars, with inscriptions, was found 17 meters from Via Salaria (*Not. sc.*, 1884, p. 393). In the issue of the *Notizie* for February, 1885, page 42, there is a report of the discovery of another chamber, 10 meters from Via Salaria and *à breve distanza* from the first, which contained seven sarcophagi. The following issue (March, 1885, p. 74) contains a reference to the second chamber as found "last month" and an account of the discovery of a third chamber, in the same vicinity, with three more sarcophagi. The chambers themselves are little described, and there is no precise statement on their situation in relation to one another. Hence it is difficult to say how strong the presumption is that the two chambers with the sarcophagi belonged to later generations of the family identified, by the inscriptions in the first chamber, as the Calpurnii Pisones. There would seem to be a substantial possibility, in any case, that the property passed from one family to another.

As the authors note, one of the first seven sarcophagi was unsculptured and has disappeared. The other six were described in the *Notizie* and were promptly illustrated, as has been mentioned, in the *Mélanges*. Illustrations of the three found later were not published promptly, but they were promptly described, and there can be no doubt that the sarcophagi now published are really the same nine. In a passage that escaped the authors but not the keen eye of D. M. Robinson (*Classical Weekly*,

January 25, 1943, pp. 137-39), Lanciani says that he was present in the first chamber in the month of its discovery (*Pagan and Christian Rome*, pp. 276-80); and he is reliably quoted (Robinson, *loc. cit.*, and letter) as having said verbally that he was present at the excavation of the sarcophagi in the other two chambers. In his book he describes the chambers as constituting "the richest and most important of those [tombs] found in Rome in my lifetime," and it is evident that the discoveries in this vicinity were objects of great interest.

In the work under review (p. 79) the sarcophagi are declared to be "extraordinarily original works." Some competent observers have found it hard to believe them antique. There may possibly be some question as to whether the plaster that fills the gaps between the fragments is the only new material, as stated on page 10; but it is clearly beyond question that the sarcophagi are genuine.

F. P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago

*The Agamemnon of Aeschylus: Translated into English with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes.* By ARCHIBALD Y. CAMPBELL. London: University Press of Liverpool (Hodder & Stoughton), 1940. Pp. xxi+95.

Of recent years there have been many attempts to render the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus. Louis MacNeice made one, and Miss Hamilton another; then there was George Thomson's translation in his new edition of the *Oresteia*, and now Professor Campbell. The task of translating the *Agamemnon* is one of the bitterest and, in a sense, most thankless tasks a translator can set himself. It is a play in which the poetry is of a peculiarly tight-knotted character, archaic, symbolic, and liturgical. Such Greek is perhaps the most difficult to render into another tongue; and consequently Aeschylus and Pindar, its prime exponents, remain only inadequately approached, but never attained, in English.

In the present version Mr. Campbell has made a valiant stab at this task. He has tried hard to keep the austere form and hard concreteness of much of the original. In this he is, I

think, more successful than either Miss Hamilton or Mr. Thomson, though not nearly so successful as Mr. MacNeice. He has sometimes the knack of conveying exactly the mood and feeling of Aeschylus, as in the first chorus of the *Agamemnon* (which is frigid in MacNeice's verse), even when he is not able to cling to the original verse rhythms, as MacNeice always does. But—and in the opinion of this reviewer it is a very big *but*—Mr. Campbell has had far too little scruple in extending or exaggerating the effects of his original, without any adequate justification in inducing a comprehension which a literal rendering would deny the English reader. Through this fault certain of the very finest aspects of Aeschylus' poetry—its hard inexplicitness, which makes so striking an impress on the mind and, as it lodges there, grows richer and profounder than any explicitness—is often watered down in Mr. Campbell's version to a gorgeous and even pompous rhodomontade. For instance, in the Watchman's speech at the very beginning of this play, the dramatic violence of the opening is continued, by implication, in the speech itself. Other men watch the stars for the weather, for the crops, for all that the stars mean to the life of a primitive people. He, the Watchman, seeks only the "vocal signal of Troy's overthrow." Aeschylus does not make the contrast of the watching of other men and this man overt. But Mr. Campbell does, and we have two entirely unnecessary lines, "But I no season wait nor ever dawned/The beam I seek, before" (Campbell, ll. 10, 11), which ruin the purposeful suppressed contrast. "The great ox on my tongue" (Ag. 36) becomes not "a great ox" but "my tongue bestrid/by the ox that stirs not." Of the wonderful series of adjectives at *Agamemnon* 154 f., qualifying and achieving an indescribable poetic compression, the two simply signifying "home-keeping, remembering," are rendered by the unfortunately explicit "and a home bred fiend, unstilled while a monarch walks" (Campbell, l. 190). The rest of the epithets are translated so confusedly with an effect so turbulent and haphazard that the savage precision of the original statement is quite lost. The simple force of "One can hear the voices of conquerors

and conquered, different as their fates are different" (Ag. 324 f.) is really shamefully rendered in "So captured then and captors clamorously/in the same street through truceless languages/raise jarful utterance of their diverse lot" (Campbell, ll. 407-9). Perhaps an even worse example than the last is in the rendering of the famous speech of Clytemnestra "There is the sea, and who shall drain it dry?" (Ag. 958-60), which turns out as "There is the sea—who shall deplete that—fostering her own proliferate purple stain/of dyes industrial an exhaustless jet" (Campbell, ll. 1115-17). Maybe the difficulty of the work is an excuse for these amplifications, digressions, and swellings of style, but this reviewer takes leave to doubt it.

DAVID GRENE

University of Chicago

*The Green Glazed Pottery.* By NICHOLAS TOLL.

With technological notes by FREDERICK R. MATSON. (*The Excavations at Dura-Europos Conducted by Yale University and the French Academy of Inscriptions and Letters, Final Report IV*, ed. M. I. ROSTOVITZ, A. R. BELLINGER, F. E. BROWN, and C. B. WELLES, Part I, Fasc. 1.) New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1943. Pp. iv+95+20 pls. \$2.00.

Continuity is essential for a complete understanding of a history of past ages. It is for this reason that the archeologist, historian, and ceramist should value this energetic appraisal and chronological dating of the green glazed pottery from Dura and the partially excavated tombs of the Parthian period in the necropolis at Bazhus (Erzi) some 30 kilometers southeast of Dura. This monograph by Dr. Toll has been collected, assembled, and catalogued with painstaking thoughtfulness and has been further supplemented by numerous cross-sections of the pottery, as well as some twenty photographic plates of the ware. The result is an admirably detailed picture of a pottery whose importance is well worth the consideration of all, for, as Dr. Toll says,

the Dura material was found during the regular excavation and represents an almost complete

cross-section of the pottery in use. Second, this material reveals the evolution of glazed ware during the first three centuries of our era. Third, it illustrates the differences between the glazed pottery of the various parts of Mesopotamia. Finally, it serves as a connecting link between Parthian and Sassanian green glazed pottery.

The material has been arbitrarily classified according to thirteen types of vessels used (jugs, craters, globular jars, etc.) and again subdivided according to the shape of the body, decorations, and peculiarities in types of neck, lip, foot, and handles employed. In the critical passages included in the catalogue the author leans heavily upon the technical vocabulary of the ceramist. To throw additional light upon the subject Dr. Toll has employed the services of Frederick R. Matson, who has devoted the last few pages of the work to a detailed discussion of the ware under the title "Technological Notes on the Pottery."

Little criticism can be made on Dr. Toll's methods of cataloguing, but one is rather baffled by omissions such as occur on page 14 with vases Nos. 1938-4826 and 1938-4828. It is perhaps to be regretted that his versatility with ceramic terms has resulted in a rather confused terminology. Unfortunately, one may find such terms as "devitrification" (p. 3), which is a high-temperature process occurring in the region between the strain point and the liquidus, confused with weathering or leaching; or, again, the use of the term "high fire" to a temperature of 1,000° C., which in most ceramic books is labeled in the low series.

The excellent work contributed by Mr. Matson adds much to this volume; but, as he says on page 90, "any conclusions reached must be tentative because only one green glaze sample was analyzed from each site." However, he has ascertained from his experiments that the green-colored glazes used at Dura belong to the "soda-lime-silica" group of glasses and have iron and copper as their principal coloring oxides. The ware is usually composed of a finer-textured clay than that used for the unglazed pottery and has been fired to a temperature approximating 1,000° C.

In conclusion one may say that this book embodies the results of a great deal of work on



the part of the author and presents a picture of the pottery which adds considerably to the existing knowledge of ceramics in the Near East.

*Oriental Institute  
University of Chicago*

CAMERON PAULIN

*Diodorus of Sicily*, Vol III. With an English Translation by C. H. OLDFATHER. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. 433+2 maps. Cloth, \$2.50; leather, \$3.50.

This volume contains the text and translation of Book iv, chapters 59-85, and Book v of Diodorus' *Library of History*, together with the fragments of Books vi-viii. It is perhaps worth while to note that a considerable part of the fragments of Book vii is found only in the Armenian translation of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius. Professor Oldfather has chosen to give as the text of this portion Petermann's Latin translation of the Armenian but has based his own English version upon Karst's German version of the Armenian. This seems a satisfactory procedure, since very few readers could make any use of the Armenian text and Karst's German seems to have some points of superiority over Petermann's Latin.

The English translation maintains the excellent standard set in the earlier volumes. If one may venture a criticism, however, it is that the author at times seems to feel it necessary to explain as well as to translate. Thus in v. 10. 1, the sentence, "These, then, are the reasons," does not correspond to anything in the Greek text. Similarly, in v. 23. 1, the words "or amber" are an insertion of the translator. If such supplements are really essential, would it not be better to include them in parentheses? One of the extremely few cases where the accuracy of the translation may be questioned occurs in v. 10. 3, where the phrase *ἐκ τῆς ἀπολαύσεως* is rendered "when one subsists upon them." The words of Diodorus taken in their context hardly justify the idea of subsistence; they merely express the pleasure derived from enjoying, that is, eating, the fruit of the trees.

Typographical errors are rare, but on page 126, line 26, *συμφορᾶς* occurs for *συμφορᾶς*, and on page 142, line 19, *οἶνον* for *οἶνον*. The volume contains two maps which serve to illustrate the historical and geographical descriptions of Diodorus in the books contained in this volume. Unfortunately, there is some confusion in nomenclature in the map of Sicily and Greece. Most of the place names are given in the Latin form, but a considerable number occur in Greek guise, and Thebes and Corinth are frankly Anglicized.

A. E. R. BOAK  
*University of Michigan*

*A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* By ARTHUR E. R. BOAK. 3d ed. New York: Macmillan Co., 1943. Pp. xiii+552. \$4.50.

It is a pleasure to welcome the new edition of this excellent text. Like its predecessors, it gives a remarkably great amount and variety of valuable information in relatively small space, though several of the sections that formerly were unduly compressed have been expanded. In addition, there has been considerable recasting and rearranging. The result is a more readable version, which is likely to prove easier to students. Yet the most remarkable feature of the revision is its thoroughness. Again and again not only longer passages but also shorter statements—sometimes even single clauses or phrases—show that the author has revised his account in the light of recent research.<sup>1</sup> Since there are few footnotes and merely a list of "Supplementary Readings" (pp. 521-31) in English rather than a full bibliography, there is little to guide the reader to the special studies that have caused these revisions; but, of course, it is not the purpose of the author to give such a guide. Undoubtedly, scholars will find points with which to quarrel, but that is not to be considered a drawback. One point may be mentioned. If the value of ancient money is given in dollars and cents, should it be given the same now as before 1933? The printing is ex-

<sup>1</sup> Do not look for the very latest. In these days printing is slow. The Preface is dated July, 1942.

cellent and typographical errors and slips in details are very few.<sup>2</sup>

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

*Greek Interpretations.* By T. B. L. WEBSTER.  
Manchester: Manchester University Press,  
1942. Pp. viii+128+8 pls. 5s.

This book is not merely another series of interpretations of Greek literature and art but is also designed to set forth a method for the teaching of Greek in English—"detailed commentary on representative passages of Greek literature set in their peculiar background of history." It is, as the title implies, essentially a collection of separate studies—"Homer," "Solon of Athens," "Ionia in the Sixth Century," "The Court of Hiero," "Antigone's Apology," "Melian Dialogue," "Plato's City," "Menander," "Theocritus," and "Aeneas and Rome." The method used by the author is to quote in translation some illustrative passage as the core of the chapter and, by analysis, discussion, and examples drawn from contemporary works of art, make it illustrative of the general pattern of thought of the particular period. The sections are not, however, completely detached, as a few paragraphs at the beginning of each chapter trace the political, literary, and artistic links between the various landmarks. The result is a necessarily meager but clear picture of Greek culture from Homer to Virgil.

Such a result, then, justifies the author's suggested method of teaching Greek in English. As the book stands, however, it is incomplete in its correlation of artistic and literary examples. A familiarity with Greek art is presupposed, but to make clear the author's points to one unfamiliar with it a large number of plates would be necessary. Those used are not referred to in the text and are merely designed to illustrate the ordinary level of Greek art at different periods. Most of them are vases in Manchester museums. Despite this handicap (understandable in an English book published in 1942), the book has the merit of mak-

ing its author's suggestions for teaching very feasible and of presenting clearly the views of a competent scholar on important phases of Greek culture.

CARL ROEBUCK

Dalhousie University  
Halifax, N.S.

*The 'ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ* Ascribed to  
*Xenophon and Its Historical Background.* By  
ALEXANDER FUCHS. Jerusalem, 1942. [In  
Hebrew.]

This monograph is an offprint of articles published in the Hebrew quarterly journal *Tarbiz*, Volumes XIII and XIV. The author, a pupil of Schwabe and Tschirikower of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, attempts to discover the purpose and date of the *'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία*. After reviewing recent literature, including the full treatment by Ernst Kalinka, *Die pseudoxenophontische A. II.* etc. (Teubner, 1913), Fuchs comes to the conclusion (p. 50) that the work was written ca. 415 B.C. by an oligarchic extremist who wished to prove to the moderates, led by Theramenes, that there was no hope of reforming the democracy. Fuchs further suggests that the work may have been written in answer to a pamphlet composed by a moderate who criticized the democratic extremists but opposed an oligarchic revolution.

RALPH MARCUS

University of Chicago

*More Poems from the Palatine Anthology.* By  
DUDLEY FITTS. Norfolk, Conn.: New Di-  
rections, 1941. Paper, \$0.50; bound, \$1.00.

This book, containing versions of forty-nine poems from the Palatine Anthology, is a supplement to Mr. Fitts's edition of one hundred poems from the same source, published about four years ago. The poems are for the most part gracefully and ingeniously done, though perhaps real translation would serve the reader's interest at least as well, if not better, than the paraphrase.

DAVID GRENE

University of Chicago

<sup>2</sup> On p. 153, n. 6, for p. 181 read pp. 109-10. Insert the same reference in the Index under *Ager Gallicus*.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Books submitted are not returnable.]

- AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. LXXIII (1942). Lancaster, Pa.: Lancaster Press, Inc.; London: B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., 1943. Pp. vi+415+xcii.
- Berytus*, Vol. VIII, Fasc. 1. Published by the Museum of Archeology of the American University of Beirut, 1943. Pp. 72.
- DANIEL, GLYN E. *The Three Ages: An Essay on Archaeological Method*. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1943. Pp. 60.
- DAVIDSON, GLADYS R., and THOMPSON, DOROTHY BURR. *Small Objects from the Pnyx: I. (Hesperia, Suppl. VII.)* American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1943. Pp. vi+172. \$5.00.
- DÜRING, INGEMAR. *Aristotle's De partibus animalium: Critical and Literary Commentaries*. ("Göteborgs Kungl. Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Samhälles Handlingar," Följden 6, Ser. A, Band II, No. 1.) Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerbers Förlag, 1943. Pp. 223. Kr. 10.
- FIGUEIREDO, FIDELINO DE. *Depois de Eça de Queiroz*. São Paulo: Editora Clássico-Científica S/A, 1943. Pp. 135.
- HENRY, SISTER ROSE DE LIMA. *The Late Greek Optative and Its Use in the Writings of Gregory Nazianzen*. (Dissertation, Catholic University of America.) ("Catholic University of America Patristic Studies," Vol. LXVIII.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1943. Pp. xx+108. \$2.00.
- Hermathena*, No. LXII (November, 1943). Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.; London: Longmans, Green & Co. 3s.
- HUNT, RICHARD, and KLIBANSKY, RAYMOND (eds.). *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, Vol. I, No. 2. London: Warburg Institute, 1943. 18s.
- MARSH, FRANK BURR. *Modern Problems in the Ancient World*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1943. Pp. 123.
- OATES, WHITNEY JENNINGS, and MURPHY, CHARLES THEOPHILUS. *Greek Literature in Translation*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1944. Pp. xvi+1072. \$5.00.
- PLUMPE, JOSEPH C. *Mater Ecclesia: An Inquiry into the Concept of the Church as Mother in Early Christianity*. ("Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity," No. 5.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1943. Pp. xxii+149. \$2.00.
- SHAKESPEARE, WILLIAM. *The Histories and Poems of Shakespeare*. ("Modern Library Series.") New York: Random House, 1943. Pp. iv+1153. \$0.95.
- UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO. *Boletins da Faculdade de filosofia, ciências e letras*, Vol. XXVII, Letras, No. 2. São Paulo, Brasil, 1942.

egu-

of  
.00.  
sub-  
ans,

OND  
lies,  
ute,

the  
exas

HY,  
in  
reen

uiry  
in  
of  
y,"  
ver-  
149.

Po-  
Se-  
Pp.

da  
Vol.  
942.